FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 105 *31 May 1983*

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Soviet Government Statement on Arms Talks Issued AA 1
PRAVDA Carries Statement [28 May] AA 1
U.S. Response Scored [Krasikov] AA 3
Foreign Reaction Noted [PRAVDA 29 May] AA 4
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Contrasts U.S., USSR Arms Stands AA 6
[Col. M. Ponomarev, 29 May]
Soviet Government To Prevent 'Nuclear Blackmail' AA 9
Soviet General Interviewed on Geneva Talks [BTA] AA 10

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1
[Beglov, Kornilov, Agayants]
MX Decision, U.S. Policy CC 1
Williamsburg Summit, Problems CC 4
Developing Countries' Problems CC 6
USSR Statement on Disarmament CC 6
'International Situation: Questions & Answers' CC 7
[Gubernatorov, Belyavey, Kovalev, Semenov]
USSR Peace Initiatives Hailed CC 7
Situation in Lebanon Viewed CC 8
Portugal's Election Assessed CC 10
PRAVDA on 'Roadblocks' Confronting CSCE Meeting [29 May] CC 10
Williamsburg Economic Summit Reported, Analyzed CC 12
Beglov, Druzhinin on Problems CC 12
TASS Reports 'Stormy Debates' CC 14
Moscow Radio Comments [Sobolev, Doronin] CC 15
TASS on Summit Statement CC 17
U.S. 'Imposed' Statement CC 18
Soltan Commentary CC 19
TASS Military Analyst [Bogachev] CC 20
Summit Adopts Communique CC 21

UNITED STATES & CANADA

AFP: Foreign Ministry Protests on New U.S. Embassy A 1
Fleet Workers Union Protests U.S. Visa Refusal A 1
Representatives of U.S., USSR Meet in Minneapolis A 1
Trade Seminar Held A 1
Joint Statement Adopted A 2
Further on U.S. Congress Vote on MX Development A 3
[IZVESTIYA 27 May]
House Approval of Neutron Charge Funds Reported A 4

WESTERN EUROPE

Spanish Foreign Minister Moran To Visit Moscow G 1
Visit Previewed [Malynin] G 1
Mutual Relations Reviewed [IZVESTIYA 28 May] G 1
Upcoming Weinberger Visit to FRG Previewed G 2
Deployment Timetable Delivered G 2
Reasons for Visit Viewed G 3
'Heightened Pressure' G 3
FRG Official's Remarks on Pershing's Attacked [PRAVDA] G 4
Zamyatin in FRG for 'Cultural Days' Festivities G 5
Meets Dortmund Officials G 5
Comments on Disarmament Proposals [DPA] G 5
Brandt Receives Zamyatin G 6
Views Exchanged [DPA] G 6
Cultural 'Cooperation Plan' Signed [DPA] G 6
British Parliamentary Election Issues Discussed G 7
Missile Deployment Issue G 7
[Shelkov in PRAVDA 28 May]
Party Platforms Viewed G 7
NATO Military Exercises in Turkey Criticized G 8
[PRAVDA 26 May]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Gromyko Receives Iranian Ambassador 27 May H 1
U.S.-Israeli Actions in Lebanon Scored H 1
Lebanese, Syrian Tension Said Escalating H 2
[Losev in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 28 May]
U.S., Israel Prepare 'Aggression' Against Syria H 4
Military Actions Noted [PRAVDA 29 May] H 4
Situation 'Aggravated' H 5

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

USSR, WPC Publicly Condemn RSA Maputo Raid J 1
TASS Statement J 1
WPC Issues Statement J 1

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

U.S. White Paper on Central America Scored K 1
Stone's Role as C.A. 'Mediator' Questioned [Baryshev] K 1
Moscow Views Shuffle of U.S. Officials K 2
U.S. Military Activities in El Salvador Noted K 3
Military Advisers' Role [Olin] K 3
Training of Salvadoran Troops K 3
Further on Cadets' Training [Levchenko] K 4
'Secret' U.S. Guatemalan Expansion Noted K 4

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

CPSU Politburo Member Pelshe Dies 29 May R 1
Announcement of Death R 1
[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 31 May]
Medical Statement Released R 1
[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 31 May]
Obituary Published R 1
[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 31 May]
Funeral Commission Appointed R 3
[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 31 May]
Public Viewing Announced R 3
[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 31 May]
Politburo as Honor Guard R 3
Politburo Discusses Food Program, Education R 4
New Foreign Economic Relations Chief Appointed R 5
Communist Party Cadres Purged in Moscow Region [AFP] R 6

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Weather Poses Difficulties for Agriculture T 1
Flood Damage in Latvia T 1
Cyclone, Snow in Kazakhstan T 1
Progress in Feed Preparation Reported T 1

SOVIET GOVERNMENT STATEMENT ON ARMS TALKS ISSUED

PRAVDA Carries Statement

PM271619 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 May 83 First Edition p 1

["Soviet Government Statement" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] The deployment of the new medium-range U.S. nuclear missiles on West European territory planned for the end of 1983 is an integral part of the U.S. Administration's efforts to gain military superiority. With the ability to hit targets deep inside the Soviet Union's territory, these missiles are designed to become a direct addition to the U.S. strategic nuclear arsenal and to alter the existing regional and global balance in the West's favor. The deployment of these missiles would lead to a serious change in the situation in Europe, whould sharply aggravate nuclear confrontation, and would increase the risk of the outbreak of war.

At all talks directly, or indirectly, linked with curbing the arms race the U.S. Administration pursues an unconstructive, obstructionist line. This applies to the U.S. conduct at the talks in Geneva, Vienna, Madrid, and other international forums.

The U.S. stance at the Soviet-U.S. talks on strategic arms limitation and reduction is wholly geared not to an honest accord but to obtaining one-sided military advantages. In proposing that the most modern types of armaments be reduced on the Soviet side and, moreover, in a considerably larger volume than on the U.S. side, Washington does not conceal its intention to leave virtually intact the foundations of its own nuclear arsenal and its extensive programs for deploying the latest strategic weapons -- including cruise missiles in all basing modes. The U.S. proposals at the START talks are aimed not at halting but essentially at further fueling the strategic arms race along all salients which the United States considers to be to its advantage.

In view of the mounting threat to the security of the USSR and its allies as a result of the development, production, and adoption of the new U.S. land-based, sea-based and air-launched strategic armaments, the Soviet Union has been faced with the need to take retaliatory steps to consolidate its defense capability, including through the deployment of corresponding new strategic systems. These steps on the Soviet Union's part are dictated by the situation which has actually taken shape and will be its response to the U.S. actions. Their sole aim is to prevent the disruption of the existing balance of forces.

In taking these enforced steps the Soviet Union at the same time confirms the unaltered nature of its principled approach to the problem of strategic nuclear arms limitation and reduction. It advocates deep reductions [glubokiye sokrashcheniya] of these arms throughout their entire range in the interests of enhancing overall military strategic stability while strictly observing the principle of equality and identical security.

The far-reaching proposals submitted by the Soviet Union in Geneva on the mutual reduction of strategic delivery vehicles and the nuclear warheads carried on them provide a good basis for this.

The Soviet Union takes an equally constructive stand on the question of limiting medium-range nuclear arms in Europe. As is known, the Soviet Union proposes carrying out reductions in these arms in such a way that it will have no more medium-range missiles and warheads on them than Britian and France.

This would be appreciably less in terms of both delivery vehicles and warheads than the USSR had in Europe in 1976, when the modernization of Soviet missiles had not yet begun. And the Soviet does not aspire to a single medium-range aircraft or a single airborne nuclear charge more than the NATO countries would have.

However, the United States continues to insist on a decision under which it would in any case begin installing its new missiles in West Europe at the end of 1983 in addition to the American forward-based nuclear means already there. And the Soviet Union would have to give its consent to their deployment, as well as unilaterally reducing its own medium-range missile arms, and not just in the European but also in the Asian part of the country, ignoring the analogous U.S. arms deployed in considerable numbers in regions bordering on our country in the east.

The deliberate unacceptability of such proposals is so obvious that the U.S. advancement of them can attest to just one thing -- a marked reluctance to seek mutually acceptable solutions based on the principle of equality and identical security.

The Soviet Union deems it necessary to warn most definitely that, if the accord on limiting nuclear arms in Europe, which rules out the deployment of new American missiles there, is thwarted and an additional threat to the security of the USSR and its allies is created as a result, the Soviet Union will take timely and effective countermeasures in this sphere too.

The U.S. and NATO decision to begin deploying new American missiles in Europe, if implemented, will force the USSR to revise the decision which it adopted last year on a unilateral moratorium on the further deployment of medium-range means in the European zone. The need would also arise to implement, in agreement with the other Warsaw Pact states, other measures for the deployment of additional means with a view to creating the necessary counterbalance to the growing grouping of U.S. forward-based nuclear means in Europe and the nuclear arms of other NATO countries. It would also be necessary, as the Soviet side has repeatedly warned, to take necessary countermeasures having the territory of the United States itself in view.

A possibility exists for finding a just accord at the Geneva talks. The abandonment by the United States and NATO of the practical deployment of the new American missiles in West Europe would accord with the achievement of this objective.

The Soviet Union states that it is still not too late to halt the dangerous exacerbation of the situation. It expresses the hope that the United States and its NATO allies will carefully weigh the consequences which would inevitably result from the implementation of their plans to deploy the new American missiles in West Europe and will respond to the constructive Soviet proposals.

As a first, most easily implementable, and at the same time effective step -- pending [vpred do] the reaching of accord on reductions of both nuclear weapons in Europe and strategic arms -- the Soviet Union again proposes a quantitative freeze on these weapons and the maximum limitation [maksimalno ogranichit] of their qualitative modernization.

It is the duty of all states to find a solution to the urgent tasks of limiting and reducing arms, primarily nuclear arms, and to return to the path of detente -- political and military. This is demanded by the interests of all peoples and states irrespective of which geographical region of the world they inhabit or under which socioeconomic system they live and irrespective of which political grouping or current they belong to.

U.S. Response Scored

LD300913 Moscow TASS in English 0858 GMT 30 May 83

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS -- By TASS political news analyst Anatoliy Krasikov:

Hypocrisy is the best word to described the U.S. State Department's official reponse to the Soviet Government's statement on the planned deployment of new American medium-range nuclear systems in Western European territory. Central to the U.S. stance, reiterated by the State Department, is the mendacious assertion about the USSR's aspiration to retain the "monopoly" on medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe. Meanwhile, such "monopoly" does not exist, since the U.S. NATO allies -- Britain and France -- have such missiles.

According to the State Department, they should not be taken into account, for the British and French systems are a national strategic deterrent intended to defend France and Britain, rather than to deter an attack on other NATO member-states. The USSR could also say with equal success that its systems, which do not reach U.S. territory, are national means of deterrence intended to defend its own territory (against an attack from Western Europe), rather than to deter an attack against other countries.

We shall not go into sophistry, but shall bluntly state: Soviet people are not so naive as to agree to balancing the level of their armaments with the level of one of the states of the Western military bloc (in this case, the United States) and pretend that they do not see similar armament possessed by other members of the bloc. Soviet people are not so naive as to turn a blind eye to the nuclear threat posed to them by America's so-called "forward-based systems" in central Europe.

In the light of what has been said, one cannot assess otherwise by as hypocrisy the State Department's words about its welcoming the Soviet Union's declaration of its striving for substantial reductions, but rejecting its contention that the U.S. proposal is one-sided.

No less hypocritical is the prattling of officials in the present American Administration about the motives which guided the Soviet Government in its open explanation of its position on this issue.

According to THE NEW YORK TIMES, American officials in Washington interpreted the latest Soviet statement as an attempt to divide the West. Another American paper, The WASHINGTON POST, adds that the Americans and NATO officials regard the Soviet statement as an attempt to influence the Williamsburg summit. The authors of such declarations do not even notice that they turn themselves into a laughing stock. Indeed, what "division" or "splitting" can one talk about, if the USSR, on the contrary, has viewed and continues to view NATO countries as a single bloc?

Besides, socialist countries never overestimated the degree or autonomy enjoyed by NATO's Western European members with regard to their overseas leader. The limited character of freedom of action of the majority of Western powers is also reaffirmed by the Williamsburg meeting. The French newspaper LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS points out today that "having no possibility to exert effective pressure on Washington," Western Europe "plays the card of America's faithful ally in the hope that Uncle Sam, in turn, will appreciate this by making some economic concessions."

A real alternative to the suicidal course of Reagan and those who back him willy-nilly is offered by the demands of the broad sections of the American and Western European public. New and new sections of society join in the mass anti-war movement. Suffice it to recall the recent actions by the influential religious communities in the United States, West Germany, and Britain for the removal of the nuclear threat and for ensuring all peoples the right to life. These actions show that the hypocrisy of the present American administration and its attempts to deceive its own and other peoples suffer a failure.

Foreign Reaction Noted

PM310921 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS roundup dated 28 May: "Duty of All States"]

[Text] World public opinion has perceived the Soviet Government statement in connection with the U.S. Administration's planned deployment of new American medium-range nuclear missiles on the territory of West Europe as new proof of the USSR's love of peace and of its responsible approach to problems affecting the fate of all mankind. Setting forth and commenting on this important document, the mass media of foreign countries point out that the Soviet Union is faced with the need to take countermeasures to strengthen its defense capability in response to the actions of the United States, which is trying to change the existing regional and global balance in the West's favor. Evaluating highly the constructive nature of the stand taken by the Soviet Union, which seeks to reach agreement on reductions both in nuclear arms in Europe and in strategic weapons, the press, radio, television, and eminent politicians and public figures in a number of countries voice support for the opinion expressed in the statement: It is the duty of all states to find a solution to urgent tasks and to return to the path of detente -- political and military detente.

"It is still not too late to halt the dangerous exacerbation of the situation," "the USSR will not permit the equilibrium of forces to be upset," "the preservation of peace is a task of paramount importance" -- under these headlines Bulgarian newspapers publish the full text of the statement.

"In view of the growing threat to the security of the USSR and its allies as a result of the development, production, and combat commissioning of new American ground-, sea-, and air-based strategic arms, the Soviet Union is faced with the need to take countermeasures to strengthen its defense capability," Czechoslovakia's RUDE PRAVO writes. "At the same time the Soviet Government confirms its determination to substantially reduce and lower the level of strategic arms on condition of strict observance of the principle of equality and equal [ravnaya] security. The idea that it is still not too late to halt the dangerous exacerbation of the situation is the theme of the Soviet statement."

As Hungary's NEPSZABADSAG points out, as the first, most easily taken and, at the same time, effective step -- pending the reaching of agreement on reductions both in nuclear arms in Europe and in strategic weapons -- the Soviet Union once again proposes freezing these arms in quantitative terms and maximally limiting their qualitative modernization.

The newspaper NEUES DEUTSCHLAND (GDR) points out: "Moscow has warned most definitely that, if agreement on limiting nuclear arms in Europe -- agreement ruling out the deployment of new American missiles here -- is frustrated and an additional threat to the security of the USSR and its allies is created as a result, the Soviet Union will take timely and effective countermeasures."

"While taking these enforced steps," Poland's TRYBUNA LUDU states, "at the same time the Soviet Union confirms the immutability of its principled approach to the problem of limiting and reducing strategic nuclear arms. The Soviet Government statement attests that Moscow advocates deep reductions of these arms over their entire range in the interests of enhancing overall military-strategic stability, while also strictly observing the principle of equality and identical [odinakovaya] security."

THE WASHINGTON POST reports in a front-page commentary: "In the event of the U.S. and NATO decision to begin deploying new American missiles in Europe the need arises for Moscow to take measures -- in agreement with the other Warsaw Pact states -- to deploy additional means with a view to creating the necessary counterweight to the growing grouping of forward-based U.S. nuclear means in Europe and the nuclear arms of the other NATO countries." Pointing out that the Soviet Government statement was made on the eve of the Williamsburg conference of leaders of the seven leading countries of the capitalist world, the American newspaper writes: "This is the most authoritative indication yet of the countermeasures the Russians are prepared to take as a counterweight to the American missile deployment."

America's UPI reports: "Moscow has accused Washington of striving to achieve one-sided military advantages at the Soviet-American talks and warned that it will take effective countermeasures if the United States deploys Pershing II and cruise missiles in West Europe." Another American agency -- AP -- reports: "The Soviet Government has given a most definite warning that the U.S. and NATO decision to begin deploying new American missiles in Europe, if implemented, will force the USSR to reconsider the decision it adopted last year for a unilateral moratorium on the further deployment of medium-range means in the European zone."

"It follows from the Soviet Government statement," AFP reports, "that the deployment of new medium-range missiles will force the Soviet Union to increase the quantity of its weapons in Europe and to take necessary countermeasures with the territory of the United States itself in view." The statement, the agency goes on to point out, voices the hope that the United States and its NATO allies will carefully weigh the consequences which would inevitably result from the realization of their plans and will respond to the constructive Soviet proposals. The USSR has once again called for a freeze on nuclear arms in Europe and on strategic weapons.

On the question of limiting medium-range nuclear arms in Europe, Britain's REUTER agency sums up, the Soviet Union proposes carrying out reductions of these arms in such a way that it will have no more medium-range missiles and warheads on them than Britain and France. As the statement emphasizes, this would be considerably less in terms of both delivery vehicles and warheads than the USSR had in Europe in 1976, when the modernization of Soviet missiles had not yet begun.

"The Soviet Union has accused the United States of taking an unconstructive stand at the Geneva talks on limiting nuclear arms in Europe," Japan's KYODO news agency reports. The American proposals at the talks on limiting and reducing strategic arms are aimed not at halting but, in point of fact, at further whipping up the strategic arms race in those directions which the United States considers advantageous for itself.

The appeal contained in the Soviet Government statement to all states to find a solution to the urgent tasks of limiting and reducing arms, above all nuclear arms, and to return to the path of political and military detente will meet with the full understanding and support of all people of good will, an Indian radio commentary states.

This is demanded by the interests of all peoples and states, regardless of the geographic region of the world they are in, the socioeconomic system they live under, or the political grouping or current they belong to.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA CONTRASTS U.S., USSR ARMS STANDS

PM301501 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 May 83 First Edition p 3

[Col M. Ponomarev "Military-Political Review": "Strategy of Peace Against Strategy of War"]

[Text] A sense of dire alarm is gripping increasingly broad circles of the world public. As a result of the further activation of aggressive forces in the United States and other NATO countries the development of world events has assumed an extremely dangerous character. International tension is growing, the threat of war, above all nuclear war, is intensifying. This is being acknowledged increasingly frequently even by bourgeois politicians and mass news organs.

A very noteworthy feature, for example, appeared recently in the West German journal BLAETTER FUER DEUTSCHE UND INTERNATIONALE POLITIK. The journal carried an extensive roundup of documents, interviews, and statements by officials and the press under the general heading "How the United States Is Preparing West Europe for Nuclear War." We will cite just two quotations from that roundup: "We are living in prewar, not postwar, times." (E. Rostow, until recently director of the American Arms Control and Disarmament Agency) "The fact consists in the possibility of using certain nuclear arms in connection with a war which would be waged until a certain time exclusively in the European theater of military operations." (U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger)

In this connection it is not surprising that London's International Institute for Strategic Studies drew the conclusion in its latest annual report that "the lack of seriousness in the Reagan administration's approach to the prospect of nuclear war in general and nuclear war in Europe in particular has shaken all European countries."

Not that it is just a question of alarming statements by particular Washington leaders or the "lack of seriousness" in their approach to fundamental problems of concern to all mankind. Of course, these do create an atmosphere of tension and inflame the international situation. But it is not so much these statements as the practical deeds of U.S. and NATO militarist circles that pose a very real threat to the cause of peace and to the security and the very existence of the world's peoples.

It is known that first the House of Representatives and then the U.S. Senate have met the President's insistent demands and have just allocated many hundreds of millions of dollars for the further development and testing of a qualitatively new strategic weapons system -- the MX ICBM's. The go-ahead has thereby been given for the deployment of this favorite brainchild of the Pentagon and the American military-industrial complex. It is planned to begin deploying 100 MX missiles on launch sites in the states of Nebraska and Wyoming already in 1986. And although President Reagan stubbornly calls these first-strike missiles "Peacekeepers," their installation in launch silos can only exacerbate still further the danger of nuclear war. But the creation of MX missiles is just part of a very extensive program to modernize and build up the U.S. strategic offensive forces.

Whereas MX deployment, according to official data, will require $20 billion, this entire program, so the American Congressional Budget Office believes, will cost $50 billion annually over the next 5 years. And as a result the number of strategic nuclear warheads in the U.S. arsenal will increase by more than one-third.

A very extensive program for the militarization of space is also at the implementation stage. Its main directions were defined in a special presidential directive. A special space command has been set up to prepare for war in space. Ensuring conditions for achieving supremacy in space is advanced as the chief aim of U.S. military space policy.

The preparations to deploy American medium-range nuclear missile facilities in West Europe are continuing at an accelerated pace. While verbally declaring its readiness to reach agreement with the Soviet Union on limiting nuclear arms in Europe, in fact the United States is blocking the achievement of a mutually acceptable accord. It is seeking to deploy its Pershing II and cruise missiles on the continent at all costs in addition to the medium-range arms already there and is also demanding "payment" for this from the USSR in terms of a unilateral reduction of its nuclear facilities. Precisely this is the essence of President Reagan's notorious "interim solution." This "solution" can attest to just one thing -- a marked reluctance to seek mutually acceptable decisions based on the principle of equality and identical security.

Washington's desire not to reach agreement with the USSR and ease the threat of war but to deploy new missiles is evidenced by its practical actions. It has already begun constructing various military installations on the territory of a number of West European countries -- installations necessary for the deployment and servicing of these missiles. The training of the corresponding "launch teams" is entering the final stage. It has been reported, in particular, that the first group of a total of 1,600 American servicemen who are to service cruise missiles at the Greenham Common and Molesworth bases is even now ready to be transferred to Britain.

At the same time the Reagan administration is reviving plans for the deployment in West Europe of one of the most sophisticated and barbarous means of mass destruction -- neutron weapons. The Pentagon, the magazine U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT reports, intends once again to confront the NATO allies with the question of these weapons' deployment on their territory.

I could dwell on many other facts which show that the U.S. ruling circles, jointly with their yes-men in the European NATO countries, are realizing the aims of their war strategy. But, obviously, what I have said is sufficient to remind you once again of the real threat of nuclear war and the acute public alarm created by this threat.

The question arises: Is there an alternative to the nuclear catastrophe hanging over mankind? Yes, there is. This alternative is embodied in the Leninist strategy of peace consistently being implemented by the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries and in the USSR's constructive peace-loving initiatives. The Warsaw Pact states pointed to the possibility of overcoming the dangerous stage in international relations in the Political Declaration adopted at the Political Consultative Committee conference in Prague.

This outstanding document of modern times attests most convincingly that the socialist community countries place all their international prestige and political and economic potential in the pan of the scales of peace.

Concerned for the fate of mankind, they have advanced a broad program of measures to stabilize the situation in the world and very strongly emphasized and shown the need for curbing the arms race and making the transition to disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament.

And in order to begin resolving this historically important and vitally necessary task, states -- nuclear states above all -- must display the political will and readiness for cooperation. This was why the Prague conference participants called for the current talks on the entire range of questions of ending the arms race to be activated, for the suspended talks to be resumed, and for the deadlock in the matter of really limiting and reducing armed forces and arms, particularly nuclear arms, to be overcome. This call sounds particularly urgent, since at all the talks directly or indirectly connected with curbing the arms race the U.S. Administration is pursuing an unconstructive, obstructionist line. This applies to Washington's behavior at the talks in Geneva, Vienna, and Madrid, and at other international forums.

A mutual freeze on nuclear arms in Europe and on the strategic weapons of the Soviet Union and the United States in quantitative terms and the maximum limiting of their modernization could play a major role as a first step on the way to curbing the arms race. The idea of a freeze on nuclear arms is making increasingly sure headway. According to a poll conducted by the Harris service, 79 percent of Americans advocated the speediestpossible reaching of agreement with the USSR on a freeze on nuclear arsenals and a total ban on the production, storage, and use of nuclear weapons. The American Senate has adopted a corresponding reolution on this score. However, the White House rejects outright the very idea of the possiblitiy of a freeze on nuclear arsenals.

Official Washington also opposes no less stubbornly the measures to strengthen security in Europe proposed by the Warsaw Pact states. They proceed from the premise that a huge quantity of arms -- both nuclear and conventional -- is concerntrated on the European Continent, and the armed forces of two military alliances directly adjoin each other. This is why it has become the key task to prevent the deployment of a new cycle of nuclear arms here and to strive for their reduction and limitation. Full support for the Soviet initiatives on this score was voiced at the Prague conference.

Recently these initiatives have enjoyed further development. Comrade Yu.V. Andropov submitted an important proposal in his 3 May speech. Its realization would lead to approximate equality between the USSR and NATO with regard both to delivery vehicles for medium-range nuclear weapons, that is, to missiles and aircraft, and to the number of warheads on them, and this equality would be at a considerably lower level than is now the case. In the European part of the USSR there would be considerably fewer medium-range missiles and warheads on them than there were before 1976. The USSR's constructive and far-reaching proposals have been confirmed yet again in the Soviet Government statement published today.

The proposal to conclude a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of peace between the members of the Warsaw Pact and the NATO bloc occupies a special place in the Prague Political Declaration. The sides' mutual commitment not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional arms and, consequently, military force generally against each other would be at the heart of such a treaty.

Approximately 5 months have already elapsed since the Prague declaration was adopted. However, the United States and the other NATO countries still have not made a practical reply to a single proposal expounded in that document, although they have said that they will study its contents attentively.

Moreover, statements have now appeared to the effect that the socialist countries' initiatives are supposedly "not topical." What, then, it would be interesting to ask, does the West consider "topical"? The continuation of the policy of confrontation, the arms race, the desire for military superiority?

The Soviet Union and its friends and allies reject the strategy of war. But it must be clearly realized in Washington and the capitals of other NATO countries that the USSR and the Warsaw Pact Organization will find the means to respond to the actions of enemies of peace and the peoples' security.

As the Soviet Government statement emphasizes, in view of the growing threat to the security of the USSR and its allies as a result of the development, production, and combat comissioning of new American ground-, sea-, and air-based strategic arms the Soviet Union has been faced with the need to take countermeasures to strengthen its defense capability, including the deployment of corresponding new strategic systems. These steps of the Soviet Union are dictated by the actually evolving situation and will be a reply to U.S. actions. Their sole purpose is to prevent the disruption of the established balance of forces.

The Soviet Union also deems it necessary to warn most definitely that if agreement on limiting nuclear arms in Europe is frustrated -- agreement ruling out the deployment of new American missiles here -- and an additional threat to the security of the USSR and its allies is created as a result, the Soviet Union will take timely and effective countermeasures in this sphere too.

SOVIET GOVERNMENT TO PREVENT 'NUCLEAR BLACKMAIL'

LD301740 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 29 May 83

[From "International Panorama" program, presented by Spartak Beglov]

[Text] The events of this week have again very clearly delineated the two lines of approach to the question of questions in world politics, disarmament. There is, on the one hand, the USSR's constructive line, aimed at achieving agreement on a radical reduction of nuclear weapons, and, on the other, the line taken by the United States, which aims at steadily building up arsenals and at the break-up of the talks.

Under pressure from President Reagan, the U.S. Congress has just approved allocations for developing the superpowerful MX strategic missiles. Meanwhile, in Western Europe, preparations are in full swing for the deployment of U.S. Pershing and cruise nuclear missiles. In the light of this, it is understandable that there was a great response everywhere to the Soviet Government statement which gave the United States and NATO a firm warning that in answer to these activities, our country, together with its allies, will be forced to take measures to prevent the disruption of the present balance of forces.

This statement is rightly seen as an expression of the USSR's determination to put paid to ideas of nuclear blackmail against our country and all the peoples of Europe. The only path acceptable for all has again been very clearly shown, the rejection of new nuclear weapons and the achievement of an agreement on radical reductions of the nuclear arsenals.

SOVIET GENERAL INTERVIEWED ON GENEVA TALKS

AU271912 Sofia BTA in English 1833 GMT 27 May 83

[Text] Sofia, May 27 (BTA) -- The BTA weekly magazine ROUND THE WORLD carries in its latest issue an interview with the military expert from the Ministry of Defence of the Soviet Union, General Yuriy Lebedev. The interview has been made in Moscow recently by a ROUND THE WORLD staff reporter.

Mr Lebedev stresses that the position of the United States at the talks is aimed at ensuring unilateral advantages and at frustrating the task of working out agreements. Such was the role, he adds, that President Reagan's "zero option" had to play. After this American-invented version kept the talks in an impasse for almost a year and a half, it became exhausted even in the eyes of the NATO allies of the United States. Then the American party replaced the "zero option" with the "interim decision" but this, too, failed to advance them any further towards realism and constructiveness.

"The United States are unwilling to make their contribution to the drafting of a just agreement," says Mr Lebedev.

Dwelling in brief on all the practical actions and proposals set forth by the Soviet Union for the limitation of the medium-range nuclear weapons, Mr Lebedev goes on: "It is clear who wishes to achieve an agreement and who wants to continue the arms race in the name of its selfish aims."

He stresses that it has been a long time since balance of forces has been established in Europe and that is why the deployment of the new American missiles cannot be interpreted in any other way but as an attempt at disrupting the balance in favour of the United States and NATO.

At the same time the strategic balance between the Soviet Union and the United States, too, would have been disrupted: The American missiles "Pershing-2" and "cruise" will be a supplement to the strategic weapons of the United States, while the Soviet Union has no medium-range weapons which can reach the territory of the United States.

Mr Lebedev stresses that the deployment of the new American missiles in Western Europe would have reduced substantially the threshold of the nuclear conflict and would have modified qualitatively the strategic situation in the continent.

"If the American missiles are deployed, the Soviet Union will take the necessary counter-measures and will guarantee its own security and that of its allies. But the strategic situation in Europe will then change. And it will pose greater dangers," he says.

Asked about the prospects and the Euromissiles at the Geneva talks, Mr Lebedev stresses that in spite of the fact that the talks are virtually blocked by the unconstructive position of the American party to the talks, an agreement is possible and very necessary.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD291620 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0845 GMT 29 May 83

["International Observers Roundtable" program with APN political observer Spartak Beglov, TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov, and All-Union Radio commentator Nikolay Agayants]

MX Decision, U.S. Policy

[Text] [Agayants] Hello, comrades! The truly global nature of the social, economic and political tasks which are causing concern today to millions of people in various countries is an objective feature of modern times, as has been wholly confirmed by the events of the past week. The solution of these problems requires that joint efforts be combined and that the existing international relations be restructured on a democratic basis. It demands joint regulation of the overall world economy, too. The countries of our socialist community, faithful to the principle of peaceful coexistence with states having different social structures, consistently conduct a policy directed toward broad and equal cooperation of peoples in all spheres of human activity. And this yields positive results. One can say without exaggeration that the very existence of a new society and the active operation of the world of socialism, where the processes of integration are being consolidated and developed with every passing day, exert an exceptionally positive influence upon the progress of human civilization. As Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov has stressed, adding together the ideo-political, economic, and scientific and technical potentials of the fraternal countries multiplies the strength of the real socialism, allows it to develop dynamically, successfully counteract the aggressive policy of imperialism, and have an active influence upon the course of world events. In combining their efforts for joint action, the states of our community are guided by the noble aspiration to join in a common cause, make better use of the available resources and proceed together to the set goals.

The statistical data published by the CEMA countries bear witness to the fact that, despite the exacerbated international situation and the adverse consequences of the economic crisis in the capitalist world, despite the difficulties of growth and shortcomings that still exist, the community is overcoming these difficulties and shortcomings and is confidently progressing. May I remind you that with a population of only just over 10 percent of the entire population of our planet, the CEMA countries today produce about 33 percent of world output. The output of the machine-building industry increased by 15.4 percent between 1951 and 1981; steel output in the community rose from 59.5 million tons in 1955 to 210 million tons in 1980. The policy of intensified development of nuclear power engineering is proceeding successfully; housing construction has reached an unprecedented scale; and so on.

The stable nature of such all-embracing progress on the part of the CEMA member states is particularly evident when one recalls the evidence of stagnation in the economy of the capitalist countries, including the leading ones. Furthermore, our community as a whole, and many of its members in particular, have demonstrated their reliability as partners in economic and trade cooperation. We declare that we are ready to continue to develop and deepen trade and economic, scientific and technical links with all capitalist states that intend to cooperate with us on the basis of equality and mutual benefit, while necessarily observing the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act.

Unfortunately, however, the United States and its NATO partners have set out on the course of fanning international tension, stepping up the arms race and confrontation, and are attempting -- unsuccessfully, it is true -- to erect a sort of cordon sanitaire around the socialist countries and impose upon us all kinds of discriminatory conditions.

[Beglov] Of course, Nikolay Ivanovich, the successes of the socialist states in fulfilling their national economic plans and fulfilling general long-term target programs would be even more significant, and the growth in our people's prosperity would be more tangible, were it not for Washington's militaristic policy.

[Kornilov] Yes, reliance on the nuclear cudgel and the policy of unrestrained spiraling of the arms race on the assumption that sooner or later it will succeed in shattering the approximate parity of forces which has been established in Europe and the world in its own favor, remains the pivot of Washington's aggressive foreign policy. Further confirmation of this is the fact that last week, after a 4-day debate, the U.S. Senate followed the House of Representatives in approving allocation of $625 million for developing and testing of the new MX intercontinental missiles.

[Beglov] It is apposite to mention here, Yuriy Emmanuilovich, that over the last 10 years the NATO bloc has already spent the astronomic sum of $1,774 billion on implementing its militaristic programs. Now that $625 million is being plucked from the pockets of the American taxpayers, this is evidently only the first installment, since the entire program for manufacture of the MX will cost the American taxpayers, according to many American experts' calculations at least $50 billion. The manufacture of these missiles, therefore, brought about by the Pentagon strategists' plans for modernization of the American arsenal of land-based missiles and for destabilization of the general strategic situation in the world, is the biggest American project in the arms sphere in recent years.

[Agayants] Yes, this is all so, Spartak Ivanovich, but I recall that some time ago congressmen blocked the allocation of funds for this missile. Why has this earlier decision been reconsidered?

[Kornilov] One can find the answer to this question in the pages of the American press itself. This is what THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote last Wednesday: A key factor in changing the situation was Reagan's intensive lobbying campaign, playing on the fact that legislators should support the President in matters concerning national security. In the given context the term security is, of course, no more than a pretext -- the MX missiles, each of the warheads of which is 30 times more powerful than the atom bomb dropped on Hiroshima, are an aggressive first-strike weapon. Reagan himself once declared quite frankly that the aim of deploying the MX, like other weapons, is to achieve an indisputable military superiority for the United States over the USSR and to create the preconditions for a U.S. victory in any conflict, including a nuclear one, although it seems that today it should be clear to every person with common sense that it is madness and adventurism to stake on such a victory. The MX missiles are without any doubt a first-strike weapon, said Scoville, a prominent public figure in the United States and author of the book "MX: Prescription for Disaster."

I have not mentioned, either, that implementation of the MX program is contrary to one of the focal propositions of the Soviet-American SALT I and SALT II agreements, namely, the obligation not to establish additional silos for intercontinental missiles. In other words, it is by no means the security of the United States which is involved here, all the more so in that nobody is threatening the United States. What is involved here is a new and extremely dangerous spiral in the nuclear arms race and the aim to cut down with a nuclear sword the very foundations of the relaxation of tension, whatever the cost.

[Agayants] Something else which I think should be mentioned is that while Reagan and his close associates in the White House were trying to get Congress to allocate hundreds of millions of dollars for new ballistic missiles, by means of pressure, intimidation, and all sorts of other lobbying tricks, the bourgeois mass media, primarily the American media, launched a noisy propaganda campaign attempting to prove the unprovable, namely, alleging that the United States really aspires to peace.

[Kornilov] It is no accident, of course, that these two aspects coincided. There is an evident attempt to mask the U.S. policy of whipping up the arms race and to divert the attention of the American and, indeed, the international public, from the latest big allocations for such first-strike weapons as MX and to hide Washington's unwillingness to seek a mutually-acceptable agreement at the Geneva talks. Washington squanders millions upon millions on manufacturing nuclear weapons and repeatedly confirms its determination to deploy at all costs almost 600 American Pershing and cruise missiles on West European territory, turning West Europe into a hostage of someone else's policy, into a stage extra holding the weapons in the theater of military operations, as it is today fashionable to say in Washington. So, when all this is going on, every person of common sense who compares the facts and contrasts Washington's words with its deeds can only come to the conclusion that the main, the real, and -- I add -- the very dangerous content of U.S. foreign policy remains that same old stake on force and those same old hegemonistic attempts, very dangerous attempts made with the aid of force, to dictate its will upon sovereign countries and peoples.

[Agayants] Incidentally, Yuriy Emmanuilovich, we often and rightly speak of the military and political consequences of the headlong arms race unleashed by the imperialists -- but it's not just a question of that. The arms race -- and this is what I want to dwell on in particular -- exhausts mankind's economic resources, swallows up colossal material and human resources, aggravates the shortage of raw materials, energy and fresh water, and leads to increasing inflation and unemployment. According to an AP correspondent, in the world today more than $1 million are spent every minute on arms production. This is happening at a time when millions of people on earth are hungry, have no roof over their heads, or are illiterate; when millions are suffering from disease, deprivation and poverty. Even in the United States, which prides itself on its wealth and prosperity, there are today, according to official statistics, 32 million poor people, and in the European Common Market countries about 30 million. Instead of 1 tank, it would be possible today to produce 250 medium-class cars; instead of a fighter, 7 hospitals could be built; and for one bomber, a housing development for 5,000-7,000 people.

Bourgeois propaganda and representatives of the ruling circles of capitalist states keep saying that militarization of the economy is almost a boon, because it helps to overcome industrial stagnation and provides jobs for many people. Well, of course claims of this sort, which we're all heartily sick of hearing, could just be dismissed out of hand, on the grounds that they are obsolete and dilapidated and don't stand up to serious criticism. But let's simply look at the facts. In the United States there are now more than 11 million people unemployed. Pentagon chief Caspar Weinberger said somewhere that $7 billion invested in the military industry provides work for 35,000 people. Quite possibly. But here are some figures adduced by THE NEW YORK TIMES quoting the conclusions of well-known American experts: Those same $7 billion, invested in housing construction, give work to 76,000; in public health, to 77,000; in the educational system, to 100,000 people. So here, too, those who advocate the policy of militarizing the economy clearly haven't a leg to stand on. And therefore not only war, but also preparation for war, the unleashing and intensification of the arms race, are most certainly a crime against humanity.

[Kornilov] One could express that same thought, Nikolay Ivanovich, as the argument -- an absolutely correct one, I think -- that reliance on force is not only the rattling of nuclear ammunition, by means of which Washington and NATO still hope, flying in the face of reason and historical logic, to intimidate the socialist countries -- it is precisely the king-pin of all of Washington's imperial policy. The same stake is plain to see in U.S. relations with its own allies, where strong-arm tactics, diktat, pressure, coercion and blackmail are actively used by the American Administration, expressing the will of the American monopolies, in the economic sphere, foreign trade, finance. It is especially apposite to remember this now, after the opening of the conference of the leaders of the seven major capitalist powers in Williamsburg.

Williamsburg Summit, Problems

[Beglov] This is the ninth such meeting since 1975, when these meetings of the leaders of the Seven became a regular event. They were conceived primarily as a means of coordinating economic policy, and the main impetus for holding them came from the great shock to the West's economy in the mid-seventies caused by a sharp jump in the price of oil and other raw materials, and by the gold fever with the corresponding devaluation of currencies and galloping inflation. Thus, considerable hopes were attached to the idea of holding meetings of this kind.

Two tendencies eventually emerged which are worth mentioning. First, there was a steady decline in the results achieved. For example, as regards the most recent conferences, held in Ottawa and Versailles, in the judgement of some Western experts, they even did more harm than good, because, as the former U.S. vice president, Mondale, recently remarked, those meetings were wrecked by President Reagan. The other tendency is that it is becoming more and more difficult to confine the meetings to problems of an economic nature, in view of the mounting pressure of political contradictions and problems of a political nature, as well as Washington's growing inclination to subordinate the vital interests of its allies to its own narrow self-interest, and, as we've said, to the implementation of a policy of force against the socialist countries and against the rest of the world.

At the same time, there's one detail that stands out. On the very eve of the meeting, people close to the Western leaders began strenuously circulating a story according to which those taking part in the conference have already come to an agreement not to play on emotions, not to inflame passions, not to vex each other beyond measure, and to do everything to create an impression of greater unity among them than has appeared until now.

[Kornilov] Here, Spartak Ivanovich, it would be natural to ask how such a tactic is to be explained. I think it would be correct to say that they've been forced into it.

[Beglov] Yes, the need arises from the fact that the disease has become so acute, and the contradictions have assumed such proportions, and been so widely publicized as a result of the preliminary discussions for the conference that have taken place at the ministerial level in Washington and Paris, that in the corridors of power in the West they've come to the conclusion that they'd better not subject the alliance to a still greater critical overload, as it were. They've decided not to wash all the dirty linen in public and not to display openly how little substance there is in hopes that these problems can be solved.

[Agayants] But what did, nevertheless, come to light in the course of this preliminary discussion, Spartak Ivanovich?

[Beglov] Above all, in the economic sphere, what has been established is the inability of the Western governments to at all slow the development of the main illness, by which I mean massive unemployment. The irony is that the only accurate economic prediction that the Western experts have proved capable of making is, precisely, the rate of growth of unemployment. Next year, according to these calculations, it will affect 35 million people in the so-called Western community.

[Kornilov] I would add that the main cause of the disease is economic stagnation, the continuing decline in industrial production in the majority of these states.

[Beglov] Yes, and hence, of course, the two wars that are being waged on an ever-increasing scale among the capitalist states -- the financial war and the trade war.

The American monopolies have syphoned off the currency receipts of other countries, first, by reason of the excessively high exchange rate of the dollar, and second, because of the constantly growing deficit of the U.S. Federal budget, due, above all, to astronomical military expenditures. And, in order to cover that deficit, the state is forced to throw more and more securities onto the financial market, and this, in turn, attracts huge amounts of dollars from other countries, there being, of course, the temptation to obtain high interest on them.

[Agayants] No doubt, Spartak Ivanovich, we could take France as an example. French President Mitterrand recently openly accused the United States, saying that the West Europeans are, in effect, having to cover the American budget deficit, while, for instance, during Mitterrand's rule, the French franc has already endured three forced slimming operations -- to lose weight, that is -- although this has not had the expected results. France and a number of other Western European countries are demanding the introduction of a firm system to control currency fluctuations, while the United States is against such control, as they want to allow the dollar to fluctuate freely.

[Beglov] Yes, and a trade war is simultaneously going on. In this connection, the U.S. magazine BUSINESS WEEK drew a humorous comparison recently when it said that on questions of trade tariffs and import quotas the seven countries are at each other's throats. The United States, naturally, is campaigning for so-called free trade, against protectionism, but only in those cases when this is to the advantage of the U.S. monopolies. If it is not to their advantage, then -- as they did recently when they established protectionist tariffs on imports of textiles, ceramics, and special-purpose types of steel -- they let the curtain drop, so to speak, in the path of imports from other countries. The Japanese incursion into Western Europe has also led to the West Europeans' trade deficit with Japan increasing tenfold over the past decade. France, meanwhile, has lost the markets for its motor vehicles and has virtually shut down its motorcycle industry due to competition from the FRG and, again, Japan.

These economic problems inevitably remain a major topic at all these meetings and conferences and they are assuming an increasingly political nature, particularly since, under the Reagan administration, as we have already said, Washington is striving to make everything in its partners' economies and policies subordinate to the aims of the crusade, as it is called, against the USSR. And Washington's chief secret aim is to force its partners to embark on the path of economic warfare against the Soviet Union and against other countries in the socialist community.

However, as has already been shown by the sharp worsening of contradictions between the United States and the other six countries after last year's meeting in Versailles due to the sanctions adopted unilaterally by the United States against Western companies trading with the USSR, the demands to curb economic relations with the socialist countries are viewed as most unacceptable on this side of the Atlantic and in Japan, too. Washington is, therefore, trying to alternate the cold shower with soft persuasion, hints of more severe measures and various promises, while the West Europeans for their part intend to show Washington that in fact trade with the East, which provides stability for the West European economy and employment for millions of people, must be defended from fresh, crude attacks. A particularly crude challenge to the interests of the six, naturally, was the passing, on the very eve of the Williamsburg meeting, by a U.S. Congressional committee of an amendment to the export control laws in the spirit of the Reagan sanctions against East-West trade. Certain observers are of the opinion that the attempts by Washington, on the eve of the Williamsburg meeting, to muffle the polemics on questions of trade, among others, are just a tactical maneuver to try and point the gun of threats and pressure at its partners once again at some stage of the meeting itself. And whether the final state of the meeting goes according to this scenario, the world will only learn after Monday.

Developing Countries' Problems

[Kornilov] Continuing this subject, we should also of course mention that the developing countries, too, are similarly waiting in vain for the United States to implement a plan for global measures to revise the capitalist world's financial and economic policies. The Reagan government insists on preference for an individual approach and individual solutions, which condemns every country to remaining face to face with U.S. tyranny. Reagan is concerned with one thing only -- how to get from the developing countries the American share of their $600 billion indebtedness in credits and loans. Meanwhile India, for example, has suffered 25 times the humiliating refusal of a loan from the World Bank, and in each case the refusal was inspired by none other than the United States.

[Agayants] Last week, on 25 May, the progressive world public marked a portentious date -- Africa Day. It was on 25 May 1963, exactly 20 years ago, that the Organization of African Unity, which today has over 50 permanent members, was founded. The OAU, which unites all the independent states on the Dark Continent, has become an organization expressing the aspirations and hopes of its peoples under the banner of struggle against neocolonialism and racism. Until comparatively recently, and we can remember all this full well, the political map of Africa was painted in the colors of the mother powers who extended their rule to the colonies and semicolonies which they ruthlessly exploited. The national liberation struggle which developed in Africa after the end of World War II led to the liberation of many peoples and the emergence of young, independent states. However, having attained freedom and broken the chains of colonial slavery, almost all the African countries remained, as before, within the sphere of the world capitalist economy and, therefore, dependent on the multinational monopolies which retained the hope that they would be able to infinitely plunder the continent's natural and human resources.

This is why in today's conditions enormous importance for the liberated African states is being given to unity and resolute joint action to defend their political and economic interests. The Soviet Union, like the other countries in the socialist community, is on the side of struggling Africa. The greetings on Africa Day which were sent by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers to the heads of state and government and the peoples of the African Continent stress that we have always supported, and continue to support, their just struggle against colonialism, racism, and apartheid. The whole of Africa must be free and independent as the interests of its successful development along the path of economic and social progress demand. But for this it is necessary to have clear skies above our planet. Today, when the actions of the most aggressive forces of imperialism have seriously complicated the international situation and increased the threat of nuclear war, it is natural that for all peoples there is no more important or primary task than that of defending peace.

USSR Statement on Disarmament

[Beglov] Our party, our country, and our people spare no efforts to achieve that noble aim. Confirmation of this can be found in the latest Soviet Government statement, published yesterday in the central press. That statement, I would remind you, sets out again in a clear and well-defined manner the consistent and principled position of our state on disarmament questions. That statement reveals decisively the hypocritical policy of the Washington administration which aims, as before not at honest achievement of agreement at the Geneva talks, but at obtaining unilateral military advantages. In view of the increased threat to the security of the USSR and its allies resulting from the development, production, and phasing-in of new strategic U.S. weapons based on land, sea, and in the air, the statement stresses, the Soviet Union is faced with the need to take measures in response to strengthen its defense potential, including the deployment of corresponding new strategic systems.

It should be noted that such steps are dictated by the situation that is actually developing and will represent the USSR's response to the actions of the United States. At the same time, true to our principled peace-loving foreign policy course, we have supported and continue to support profound arms reductions across the board in the interests of enhancing overall military-strategic stability while strictly observing the principle of equality and equal security.

[agayants] Additionally, as the first and most easily realizable and, at the same time, effective step until agreement on reductions of nuclear arms in Europe and strategic weapons is achieved, the Soviet Union has again proposed that these weapons be frozen quantitatively and that qualitatively, modernization be limited to the minimum. To sum up, it is quite evident that it is the duty of all states and all peoples on the globe today to find a solution to the urgent problems of arms limitation and reduction, primarily nuclear arms, and to return to the path of detente, both political and military. At this point we end our program. Thank you, comrades, for listening, and all the best!

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS & ANSWERS'

LD272127 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 27 May 83

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program presented by Valentin Petrovich Gubernatorov, foreign political commentator of All-Union Radio; with Igor Petrovich Belyayev, doctor of economy; Eduard Vasiliyevich Kovalev, international affairs journalist; and K.I. Semenov, candidate of history]

USSR Peace Initiatives Hailed

[Excerpts] [Gubernatorov] Hello, esteemed radio listeners. Letters arrive for our program every day in which you give your views on topical questions of international life. Prominent in these letters is the theme of approval and support for the peace-loving foreign policy course of the CPSU and the Soviet Government and for the peace initiatives being made by our country on the international scene. I would like to express profound gratitude to our party, and to Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov personally, for their great concern for peace, and hence for life on earth, writes (Tamara Nikolayevna Trekhova) from Tyumen. I was moved to the depths of my soul by Comrade Andropov's answers to the little American girl Samantha Smith. These lines are from a letter from listener (Knyazeva) from Mogilev-Podolsk.

The impression is being created that at the Geneva talks the American side is deliberately avoiding constructive dialogue, with the aim of deploying at the end of the year, whatever happens, new nuclear missiles in West Europe. The truth is that all types of mass destruction weapons were first created by the United States, while we were merely forced to respond to them in order to maintain the balance of forces. To convince oneself of the incorrectness, to put it mildly, of the assertions by Secretary of State Shultz about the peace-loving nature of the United States, it is sufficient to make the following experiment: Take a map and draw a circle around Moscow with a radius of 5,000 kilometers, then draw a circle with the same radius around Washington. You will discover that within the circle with Moscow as its center there are approximately 250 American military bases, and you will not find a single Soviet military base within the circle around Washington.

Several of our listeners ask: Is it possible that the broad public in the West is unaware of the peace proposals of the Soviet Union?

Thus, Comrade (Yaroshchenko) from the (Krasino) Sovkhoz in Krivorozhskiy Rayon of Dnepropetrovsk Oblast writes that he was amazed to learn that not a single student from one of the American universities knew about the Soviet Union's unilateral undertaking not to be first to use nuclear weapons. Yes, comrades, the bourgeois mass media try with all their might to hide the truth about our efforts to maintain peace and to prevent a nuclear conflict. Loyal servants of their bosses, the bourgeois scribblers are ready to cook up and inflate any nonsense about life in our country and about our foreign policy, but as soon as the Soviet Union comes out with a new peace initiative, as soon as a word in defense of peace needs to be said, these hacks seem to clam up.

Situation in Lebanon Viewed

There are also many letters whose authors are interested in the situation in Lebanon. (Grigoriy Grigoriyevich Kulesh) from Ust Ilim, (Nikolay Ivanovich Turoshchenkov) from Nakhodka town, (Mikhail Sergeyevich Moysko) from the village of (Smelyy) in Sumy Oblast, and other comrades, write about this.

As you know, in the middle of May in the Beirut suburb of Khalde and later in the Israeli town of Qiryat Shemona, the so-called Lebanese-Israeli peace agreement was signed. A big hubbub was raised in the West over the signing ceremony and over the agreement itself, and it has still not yet died down. However, the peace remains on paper, and the present situation in the Near East has become even more explosive. Why does such a conclusion suggest itself after careful analysis of this document? Igor Petrovich Belyayev, doctor of economy, will tell you. Over to you, Igor Petrovich, if you please.

[Belyayev] First, let's deal with the very nature of the agreement. Formally, it is a bilateral agreement -- Israeli-Lebanese. But in fact it is a trilateral one. And here, it seems to me, an extremely important event has happened. From being the sort of honest broker written about so many times in the American press, the United States, which took part in the Israeli-Lebanese talks from the very beginning, has moved into the role of an active party to the agreement itself. In parallel with the ceremony of signing the Israeli-Lebanese agreement, there was also an exchange of letters of memoranda about the agreement between U.S. Ambassador in Tel Aviv Lewis and Israeli Minister of Foreign Affairs Shamir. Incidentally, this memorandum states that Israel is not at all obliged to withdraw from Lebanon, occupied during the Lebanon-Israeli war which began on 6 June last year, and that in general relations between Israel and the United States are now infinitely more important than the fulfillment of just that very peace agreement in question.

[Gubernatorov] So, Igor Petrovich, we are seeing how the United States, with the aid of the Lebanese-Israeli agreement, is expanding its military presence in Lebanon and in the Near East as a whole.

[Belyayev] In this connection, I should like to recall one fact that has been forgotten, so to speak -- the Americans started to consolidate their military presence in Lebanon during the Israeli-Lebanese war, and, if one recalls, quite recently the present Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Arens was saying that the United States knew from the very beginning both about the preparation for Israel's war against Lebanon, and about the war itself. There is every reason to assert that in effect the appearance of American Marines in Lebanon had been previously planned, and perhaps even concrete dates had been fixed in the tacit agreement about the war against Lebanon which probably exists between the United States and Israel.

This event also throws light on another circumstance, connected with the fact that an American representative, as I already said, took part in the talks between Israel and Lebanon from the very start. But he not only sat in as some sort of observer, or meditor -- he took an active part, twisting the arm of Lebanon, trying to make the Lebanese Government, come what may, accept this new Israeli-Lebanese agreement. And it seems to me that we are now dealing with the fact that, under the guise of an Israeli-Lebanese agreement, one of the Arab countries has had imposed upon it not simply a Camp David-style treaty. What we have here is that, in effect, the United States made dependent on the signing of the agreement by the Lebanese side both the giving of aid -- economic and military -- to Lebanon, and its behavior, so to speak, in relation to the Lebanese Republic in the Near East. It seems to me that it is precisely here that one should start any review of the events which in one way or another are connected with the imposition of this same new Israeli-Lebanese peace agreement.

[Gubernatorov] Igor Petrovich, let us now deal with the details of this agreement, in order to get a clearer understanding of why it is unacceptable to the Arab states.

[Belyayev] First, the agreement ignores the very fact that Lebanon is an Arab country. You see, for a long time there have been academic -- so to speak -- arguments over Lebanon, about whether or not it is an Arab country. The arguments turn, as a rule, on the role of the various religious communities in Lebanon. Since the president of Lebanon is a Maronite, many Western specialists on international relations and on culture and history assert that, supposedly, precisely this Christian community is leading Lebanon away from Arab influence. Indeed, many Maronites in Lebanon consider that the Lebanese, and primarily the Lebanese Maronites, are the heirs of the Philistines, that is, the Phoenicians, in general all those who at one time lived on the territory of Lebanon and who did not belong to the Arab world -- and could not have belonged to the Arab world because at that time there were no Arabs in that part of the Mediterranean. But, after all, Lebanon is a member of the Arab League. The new president of Lebanon, Amin al-Jumayyil, has stressed on more than one occasion that Lebanon is part of the Arab world. Lebanon is connected with all agreements which have been concluded within the framework of the League. But, according to the Israeli-Lebanese peace agreement, Lebanon now is not free to take any decisions whatever when they concern countries which do not have diplomatic relations with Israel. The greater part -- and what a greater -- part: -- in essence, all Arab countries apart from Egypt, do not have diplomatic relations with Israel. And so, at the present stage, as I see it, this new Israeli-Lebanese agreement is not simply a restriction of Lebanon's Arabness, so to speak. It is already a restriction on Lebanon's sovereignty. And what does this mean for this same Maronite community? A very great deal. For 350,000 Lebanese live in the Persian Gulf zone, and the greater part of their business contacts again are concentrated in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and several other Arab states. And Israel is now trying to utilize this new agreement, which formally affects only military-political questions, in order to penetrate through Lebanon into perhaps some other Arab states. And when it finds it convenient, it will block these same economic and political ties of Lebanon with the Arab world.

[Gubernatorov] But, as far as one can judge, Israel has thus far absolutely no intention of fulfilling the agreement -- mainly the section dealing with the withdrawal of its troops from Lebanese territory -- and has made all this dependent on the withdrawal of the Syrian troops and Palestinian military formations.

[Belyayev] Here we must again return to what we started with -- the Arabness of Lebanon, its membership in the Arab League. According to the mandate of the Arab League Council, there are Syrian troops and Palestinian military formations on the territory of Lebanon. And both of them appeared there after the League Council adopted a special decision on the matter.

It can be objected that on 26 July last year the mandate was not extended. Indeed, that is true. But the mandate was not annulled. The Arab League will have to examine the existing situation at its session, and raise the appropriate decision. Are there any signs that the Arab states see political aggression by Israel against their interests? Yes, there are signs of this. Kuwait has already said that all Arab countries should reexamine the existing situation and define their position. In Israel, various papers are indicating that some Arab countries, so they say, are expressing themselves positively about the agreement. And then it was clarified that this positive attitude was, so it goes, very, very phantasmal. And it seems to me that we still have to wait for a pronouncement by the Arab states about the Israeli-Lebanese agreement.

But when we say Israel has absolutely no intention of withdrawing from the territory of Lebanon, we have in mind not only that the withdrawal of Israeli troops is dependent on Syria; the thing is that one cannot compare in the same terms the aggressor and a country which is in Lebanon by a decision of the Council of the Arab League. And now Israel, as if bypassing the decision of the United Nations organization, will hold to just that point in the agreement which ties everything to the presence of the Syrian troops and to the presence of the Palestinian military formations on the territory of Lebanon. But this is a purely intra-Arab question. This is purely, if you like, a question of Lebanon's special relations with Syria. Incidentally, Lebanon and Syria do not have embassies, either in Beirut or in Damascus. Lebanon and Syria have always regulated their relations by special statute, and in this sense the Israeli-Lebanese agreement is also trying to smash this practice. And, of course, in so far as I see it, this will not give cause for approval in the Arab world.

[Gubernatorov] Thank you, Igor Petrovich, for your interesting account.

Portugal's Election Assessed

(Stanislav Tereshchenko) from Odessa asks to be told about the political situation in Portugal which has arisen after the pre-term parliamentary elections on 25 April. I will direct this question to Eduard Vasiliyevich Kovalev, journalist of international affairs, who is a participant in the program. Eduard Vasiliyevich, let us first dwell on the results of the elections.

[Kovalev] At first glance, the left-wing forces won a victory in the election. The right-wing parties suffered a defeat. But there are negative aspects to the elections which have just taken place. Thus, the left-wing forces are unable to fully enjoy the fruits of their victory. The leadership of the Socialist Party, which is influenced by primitive anticommunist prejudices, has flatly refused to cooperate with the Communists even though the Portuguese Communist Party frequently -- and even after the elections -- declared its readiness to discuss with the Socialists ways which could lead to the creation of a left-wing government of the democratic alternative.

PRAVDA ON 'ROADBLOCKS' CONFRONTING CSCE MEETING

PM301145 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 83 First Edition p 5

[Text] Madrid, 28 May (TASS) -- It has become known that many delegations taking part in the Madrid meeting have growing fears that the continuing attempts by the NATO countries to submit for discussion amendments which are totally unacceptable for the socialist countries may create an impasse once again.

It is an open secret in the lobby here that it is above all the United States which is looking for various artificial pretexts to complicate the course of the Madrid meeting and, at least, delay its completion. This is confirmed by the speech of the head of the U.S. delegation at the 26 May session of the working group, which was made in a spirit of undisguised confrontation and received a befitting rebuff from the Soviet delegation.

This line by the delegations from the NATO countries was continued at today's plenary session. The representatives of Britain, Portugal and the United States once again made demands for the introduction of their amendments to the draft final document.

The head of the Soviet delegation, Deputy Foreign Minister A.G. Kovalev, in a reply speech said that the Soviet Union's stance is well known. It was clearly and definitely set forth in the Soviet Union's appeal to the Madrid meeting's participants. It would probably be useful to recall that the appeal stresses that the course of the meeting's work showed that the positions of all participating states have by now become absolutely clear and that the possibilities for further productive talks have been practically exhausted.

The Soviet delegation, as is known, repeatedly stressed that the modified document of the neutral and nonaligned countries does not take into account a number of substantial considerations and wishes of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. We presume that it also does not take into account some considerations of the NATO countries.

Nevertheless, despite the fact that the draft document of the neutral and nonaligned countries does not fully meet our wishes, the Soviet Union took a step of exceptional importance in order to pave the way for the successful completion of the Madrid meeting, which has been going on for 2 years and 9 months.

Today's session, the Soviet representative said, shows once again what stands in the way of the successful completion of the Madrid meeting within a few days. It is being hampered by the NATO countries' amendments. No matter how they are wrapped up or in what way presented -- as "modest" or "moderate" -- they are, as we have already declared and repeat clearly again, deliberately unacceptable.

[Zavedomo] The significance of consensus is mentioned here. Well, if this is so, consensus calls for accord of the delegations from all 35 nations -- small, middle-sized and big. And the amendments in question cannot find a consensus. This is not a surprise to anyone.

What may the attempts to regenerate obviously unacceptable amendments and corrections bring about? They may bring about the delay or blocking of the Madrid meeting with consequences for the all-European process started in Helsinki, which all understand. We believe it is our obligation, or, if you want, our duty to say, as loyal partners, as a delegation which is working at the meeting in a responsible and solid way, that a miscalculation may be allowed to happen if the unacceptable amendments are insisted upon further, a miscalculation which would throw our work far back.

We know from experience that the previous all-European meeting in Belgrade far from satisfied its participants as a result of a miscalculation that was allowed to occur. What was underestimated were the Soviet Union's will and determination to uphold its sovereign rights, its legitimate interests. As for the Madrid meeting, the Soviet Union has fully covered its part of the path towards general accord, towards consensus. We ought not to regard as the final word what we heard today from some delegations. We would like to hope that they will consider once again and correctly assess the real chances which are open for the successful completion of the Madrid meeting, as well as the alternative -- which does not suit the majority of countries -- that the Madrid meeting be delayed or end in failure altogether.

What is needed now are not the attempts to impose one-sidedly one's amandments to others, but manifestation of genuine political will, political determination which could help draw closer the final and early completion of the meeting.

It was stressed during the meeting's plenary sessions and in the Prague Political Declaration of the Warsaw Treaty member-states that objectively all participants in the all-European process should be equally interested in the successes of the Madrid meeting, in continuation and development of the all-European process started in Helsinki. But in the light of the present-day situation another thing should be stressed: Responsibility will rest with those who stand in the way of early and successful completion of the meeting and adoption of a meaningful final document, who create roadblocks in the way of its success.

It should be emphasised in conclusion once again that the Soviet Union is prepared to adopt the document as it was tabled by the neutral and non-aligned countries, and we expect a response and manifestation of brand political will from all other participants in the Madrid meeting.

The same spirit permeated the speech by the head of the Czechoslovak delegation, Ilja Hulinsky. Expressing the Czechoslovak Government's support for the Soviet Union's appeal, the Czechoslovak representative called on all participants in the meeting to revive the spirit of cooperation and good will, contained in the Final Act of the all-European conference, and adopt a positive political decision as regards the draft document.

The head of the Romanian delegation, Vasile Sandru, reaffirmed his delegation's readiness to adopt the draft document of the neutral and non-aligned countries as it was tabled on March 15. If changes are introduced into the document, he said, the Romanian delegation will also propose some amendments.

Such is the atmosphere of mounting concern within the circles of the delegations in Madrid on these days.

WILLIAMSBURG ECONOMIC SUMMIT REPORTED, ANALYZED

Beglov, Druzhinin on Problems

LD301742 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 29 May 83

[From "International Panorama" program, presented by Spartak Beglov]

[Excerpt] At the end of the week a further meeting of heads of state and government of the seven leading capitalist countries, from the economic point of view, began in the U.S. town of Williamsburg. It is the ninth such meeting. The countries involved are the United States, Britain, the FRG, France, Italy, Japan and Canada.

Since these meetings have been a regular event since the middle of the last decade they already have what one might call a service record, a certain reputation. It has already become a usual thing for this conference of the greats of the whole world to be preceded by an unusual splash of gossip and expectations, of stormy discussions in the Western press. And after a meeting, as a rule, the same press and the same public circles in the West express bewilderment at their unjustified expectations in connection with the solving problems of a far-reaching and cardinal nature.

We will continue on this subject with reportage by Aleksandr Druzhinin:

[Druzhinin] At the moment, the old town of Williamsburg in Virginia has attracted the attention of the entire U.S. press, television and radio. Photographs of Williamsburg and descriptions of its historic sites are ubiquitous on the pages of newspapers and magazines. Television cameras transport the viewers into an atmosphere of entertainment and masquerade with whcih the organizers of the meeting of heads of state and government of the seven leading countries in the West have surrounded its participants.

It would appear that everything possible has been done to create the impression of a relaxed atmosphere and to represent the Williamsburg meeting as a model of friendly and egalitarian cooperation.

But despite all this, poorly concealed pessimism shows through the paragraphs of the numerous reports which are being dispatched from Williamsburg by a 4,000-strong army of U.S. and foreign journalists. The papers are writing more about disagreements between those taking part in the meeting than about unity. Observers are forced to admit that the conference of the so-called Big Seven has turned into a further attempt by Washington to impose its diktat on its partners at the talks.

The United States is apprehensive about disorder at Williamsburg, the press reports. Political observers are noting that the reason lies in Washington's aspiration to achieve at any price the establishment in the West of an economic and currency order which will fully correspond with U.S. interests. In doing so, they point out that the basic center for contradictions at Williamsburg is bound up with the problem of economic relations between East and West.

Furthermore, the existence of disagreements between the United States and its partners cannot be concealed even in official Washington circles. On the very eve of the Williamsburg meeting, journalists were assembled in the White House, and U.S. Secretary of State Shultz and Treasury Secretary Regan explained U.S. positions. [camera shows the White House, cutting to shots of journalists listening to Regan and Shultz]

What are the main problems expected to give rise to especially sharp discussion at Williamsburg? The treasury secretary listed them: inflation; high interest rates in the United States which are causing serious damage to the economies of the U.S. allies; the economic crisis and the allied problem of mass unemployment in capitalist countries; and, of course, the problem of economic relations between the countries of the East and West.

The main criteria in our approach to this problem must be considerations of a strategic and military nature, the secretary of state said frankly. Therefore, there is a need for strict observance of a ban on exports to Eastern countries of materials and goods of military significance and to refrain from widespread exports [as heard] from Eastern countries of energy resources, such as natural gas, in order not to be dependent on socialist countries. We must avoid granting trade credit to these countries.

What is the attitude of the United States to the fact that its partners are expressing dissatisfaction at the intention of the Reagan administration to have Congress pass the so-called export control bill? To be sure, this bill gives Washington the opportunity to introduce restrictions on the imports of goods from West European countries if they fail to submit to U.S. demands on curtailing trade with socialist states.

The U.S. partners have raised this question more than once, Shultz admitted. But the United States intends to be guided not by the claims of its allies but only by its own interests.

Well, then. The secretary of state had nothing new to say about the policy of the Washington administration. He merely confirmed once again that, as before, it will continue to be based on the aspirations of the United States, which means twisting the arms of its partners and forcing them to follow U.S. orders unreservedly, in spite of the considerable damage which such a course does to the economy of the West European states.

What will be the result of the meeting in Williamsburg? Even here in the White House there are no special expectations connected with it. It will be good if it even manages to preserve the appearance of an alliance between the countries of the Big Seven, one of the Washington administration staff said quite frankly to THE WASHINGTON POST.

[Beglov] And so not one of the 4,000 correspondents who have gathered in Williamsburg would take it upon himself to predict the result of the meeting, since none of the previous meetings has succeeded in producing any sort of efficacious or effective means by which it might be possible to set things to rights in the capitalist economy, with its long, drawn-out crisis, its production at a standstill, its 30 million-strong army of unemployed people which is still continuing to grow, with the currency war, with and brutal clashes on the market.

Let us add that typical of the latest Western forecasts on the outcome of the Williamsburg meeting is the stress put on the fact that the leaders of the Seven have decided to keep emotions to a minumum and, as far as possible, to avoid open clashes in order not to rock the boat of Western policy and economy excessively.

TASS Reports 'Stormy Debates'

LD300729 Moscow TASS in English 0726 GMT 30 May 83

[Text] Williamsburg (Virgina) May 30 TASS -- By TASS special correspondents E. Yegorov and N. Setunskiy:

Sessions of the summit of seven major capitalist countries, currently under way here, have revealed all acute contradictions between them on economic and monetary-financial issues.

Seeking to avoid really serious discussion of such problems in the capitalist world as economic recession, unemployment and the crisis of the monetary-financial system, the Reagan administration attempted to turn the first session already into "an exchange of courtesies." Stormy debates at the meeting, however, thwarted these calculations.

France, which was backed by Italy as indicated in the official circles of the delegations from these countries, raised the question of economic and monetary-financial policy of the Reagan administration which seeks to shift the consequences of the protracted economic crisis which has gripped the capitalist world onto its allies.

France, Italy and a number of other countries resolutely protest against the immense budget deficits caused by huge military spending, high interest rates in the United States and the artificially raised dollar rate on world money markets. Britain's Chancellor of the Exchequer Geoffrey Howe bluntly told U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Donald Regan that such policies threaten to strangle the Western European economies.

The American side, however, as Reagan's statement at the press conference shows, rejected the demands by the Western Europeans that it change its economic and monetary-financial policy. The U.S. delegation, having put pressure on a number of other participants in the meeting, also succeeded in turning down the proposal by President Francois Mitterrand of France for holding an international conference with a view to putting the capitalist monetary system in order.

A number of countries participating in the summit resolutely warned the United States about grave consequences of the adoption of an export control bill submitted by the White House to Congress, which provides for "sanctions" against foreign companies which maintain mutually beneficial trade and economic ties with socialist countries.

The attempts to achieve unity among allies on economic issues failing, the Reagan administration hurriedly rechannelled the debates into a more customary militarist direction. The American side hastily worked out and imposed on the meeting's participants the so-called joint statement reaffirming the decision by Washington and NATO to station a new generation of American nuclear missiles in Western Europe. It is noteworthy that the document was also signed by Japan although this country has nothing to do with NATO. The authors of the statement express their categorical opposition to the counting of British and French nuclear forces in the solution of the issue on limiting nuclear armaments in Europe. The essence of this position is boiled down to gaining unilateral military advantages.

Summing up the results of the first day of the summit's work, observers noted that inability of the Western leaders to resolve acute economic problems or come to accord as regards ways and means of their solution. Allan Greenspan, prominent economist, former chairman of the U.S. president's Economic Council, appearing in a CBS television programme, stressed that such complicated issues as budget deficits, unemployment and problems of international trade cannot be resolved at the meeting. He added that the "partners" accuse the United States of "exporting recession" to West European countries.

Moscow Radio Comments

LD302244 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 30 May 83

[From "International Diary" program presented by Vitaliy Sobolev]

[Text] Generally speaking, very many people in the world have drawn the correct conclusion from the Soviet Government's statement on disarmament. It proves that attempts by the West to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union in the arms race are senseless, and that the only sensible way is disarmament. In this connection, a number of Western press organs note that the statement adopted at the meeting of the leaders of the seven leading capitalist countries in Williamsburg also testifies to an unconstructive position by the West, and primarily by Washington, and its lack of desire to seek a mutually acceptable solution based on the principle of equality and identical security, and this is what the Soviet Government calls for in its statement. The Williamsburg statement confirms the decision by Washington and NATO do deploy new American medium-range missiles in West Europe.

During Saturday, Sunday and Monday, teletype machines carried quite a large volume of information from Williamsburg. However, the content of this information is fairly thin, first because the participants in the meeting were conferring on a tete-a-tete basis and, second, because those who organized the meeting were very concerned that it should not leave the same impression of sharp disagreement as did the previous meeting of the Seven in Versailles.

Since then, the positions of the participants have altered little; and the claims they make against each other have, in practice, not changed either. France now accuses the United States in that high interest rates, like the enormous American budget deficit, are disastrous for the economy of West Europe. The American representative heard the same accusations in Versailles. But now weariness and disappointment are to be heard in the voices of his European partners in the talks. President Reagan managed to bring to nothing the proposal by France that a conference of Western countries should be convened to discuss financial matters. And it is only convention that calls the meeting a conference of the seven; Margaret Thatcher came here only in order to register herself as present, so to speak, and flew home again on Sunday morning. This is the impression one is left with. But now I invite you to listen to the opinion of Anatoliy Doronin, our commentator:

Very serious problems were put forward for discussion at the Williamsburg conference -- problems linked with the aggravation of the economic, financial and currency crisis of the capitalist system. And in addition, unlike previous meetings of this kind, political, military and strategic questions were discussed. Nevertheless, reading the news agency reports from Williamsburg, it is difficult to rid oneself of the feeling that the conference there was merely a performance, the external splendor of which clearly eclipsed its content.

This feeling arises not merely because the old town of Williamsburg was chosen as the scene of the action -- a museum town, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say a museum village, which has been restored to the appearance it had way back in the 18th century, and this, moreover, done at the expense of the Rockefeller family; not just because the guard of honor was dressed in red jackets and white breeches like those worn during the War of Independence; and not because the presidents and prime ministers rode in open carriages to the accompaniment of the tune of Yankee Doodle Dandy and the sound of cannon fire; not just because the discussion of some very acute problems which disturb millions of people took place while American national dishes were being tasted -- they discussed relations with the Soviet Union over lunch; the situation in the Near East over dinner; during the next meal, as it were, in passing, they confirmed their intention to deploy new American nuclear missiles in West Europe, and in an offhand manner they discussed the situation with the economy and the finances of the capitalist world -- but because, overall, they were unable to resolve anything against the disagreements that exist objectively.

Nor were they able to work out any prescriptions to cure the chronic disease of capitalism. Indeed, previous conferences before Williamsburg showed that the capitalist world is torn by sharp contradictions which leave no hope that a conference can be held successfully. Moreover, on the eve of the meeting, they were widely quoting Gaston Thorn, president of the EEC Commission, the Eighth participant in the Williamsburg conference, who said that if the conference does not end in complete failure, then that itself would be a success. The organizers of the conference, therefore, made maximum efforts to avoid bitter quarrels and the impression is created that Reagan managed to achieve a certain amount of success. In any event, President Mitterrand did not leave Williamsburg, something which the French press did not exclude because of the acute nature of Franco-American differences.

But what is success worth, if in the end those taking part in the meeting limit themselves just to generalities about the need to defend Western democracy, to implement a joint policy aimed at reviving economic activity, to improve the situation in the international currency system, and so on -- that is to say, effectively to say nothing new. Moreover, this meeting was needed by many of its participants -- primarily President Reagan and Prime Minister Thatcher -- for internal political considerations, in connection with the forthcoming elections in their countries and, as they say, they were striving to score points.

On the eve of the conference, the Geneva newspaper ORDRE PROFESSIONNEL carried a commentary entitled: "Williamsburg -- An Empty Meeting." I think ORDRE PROFESSIONNEL can carry a concluding commentary under the same headline.

[Sobolev] Yes, one can agree that we have heard practically nothing new during the meeting. And the fact that the demands of the West Europeans for changes in economic and financial and currency policy were rejected by the United States means that the contradictions between the seven countries have not been overcome and that they will continue to deepend.

TASS on Summit Statement

LD301751 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1616 GMT 30 May 83

["Concerning the Statement Made by the 'Seven' in Williamsburg" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 30 May (TASS) -- The leaders of seven capitalist countries -- the United States, Britain, France, the FRG, Italy, Canada and Japan -- who have gathered in Williamsburg adopted a statement on 30 May. That was announced at a press conference by U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz. Using pompous language, he described it as a "message to the peoples of the whole world." What have the leaders of the seven countries really stated regarding questions of security and strengthening peace?

They declared that they will defend "freedom" and the "democratic system" in their countries and that they will preserve "sufficient military might" for this, that is, they will continue to expand nuclear arsenals and carry out extensive programs of deploying the latest types of arms. The statement totally ignores the call of the peoples to return to the road of political and military detente, to commence the solution of urgent tasks of limiting and reducing arms, primarily nuclear arms.

It is contended in the statement that the arms of the NATO countries never will be used except in response to aggression. In this case, it would be logical to expect that the nuclear states belonging to the NATO bloc, among them the United States, would follow the example of the Soviet Union and assume the clear-cut commitment not to be the first to use nuclear or other arms. But this was not done.

It is said in the statement of the "Seven" that the Western side has made proposals with the aim of achieving positive results at various international talks. But it is known that at all these talks, the participating Western countries, and first of all the United States, directly or indirectly are pursuing the line of blocking accord, are making an effort to change the existing regional and global balance of forces in favor of the West.

The leaders of the countries participating in the conference state their readiness to cooperate with the Soviet Union in arms reduction. This, of course, can only be welcomed if the words of the Western leaders accorded with their deeds, if they really are referring to finding just accords with the observance of the principle of equality and equal security. But the practical deeds of the West clearly do not tally with this statement: It was only on the eve of the conference in Williamsburg that the United States President, for instance, stated his resolve to deploy new, even more powerful missiles of the MX system and to get the necessary allocations for these aims from Congress.

How can this be squared with the statement about "dedication to the search for peace"? These are diametrically opposite positions.

In the part of the statement published in Williamsburg that deals with medium-range missile weapons, words also are at variance with deeds. On the one hand, the Soviet Union is called upon to conduct the talks in Geneva ("with impetus and urgency," while on the other hand the United States has been pursuing an obstructionist line in Geneva for a year and a half. That is the reason why the talks became deadlocked.

What, then is the essence of the calls made by the ("Seven") to the Soviet Union? Is is that they want the Soviet Union to give its consent to the deployment of American Pershings or cruise missiles in Europe, to agree to its unilateral disarmament, to a shift of the military-strategic balance in favor of NATO? That is an absurdity. But it is contained in the statement itself. It is openly said in the statement that the relevant negotiations on this question in Geneva "will determine the level of deployment" of these arms and that, if agreement on this score is not reached, then the NATO countries "will proceed with the planned deployment of the U.S. system in Europe at the end of 1983." This is the real position of the United States.

In this case, what is the value of the declarations of the leaders of the seven Western countries about their striving to press for "arms reductions," to devote their "full political resources" to "reducing the threat of war," etc.? The meaning of the statement is obvious: by using words about peace, they want to camouflage the unbridled and dangerous arms race.

[Signed] (TASS)

U.S. 'Imposed' Statement

LD301458 Moscow TASS in English 1437 GMT 30 May 83

[Text] Williamsburg (Virginia) May 30 TASS -- (TASS Special correspondent).

The so-called joint statement has been adopted at the conference of leaders of seven biggest capitalist countries, which is under way here. The statement was read out at a press conference personally by the U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz who exerted the maximum effort to depict the document as evidence of Western "unity and firmness".

But actually, as the UPI emphasised, the United States, imposing this statement upon other participants, tried to conceal the difficulties that Reagan faces in a bid to convince Western leaders that his economic recipes are the proper remedy for the whole Western World. In brief, having suffered a failure in attempts to attain unity among allies on economic issues, the Reagan administration was in a hurry to direct the discussion in Williamsburg into the usual militaristic channel. Serious differences and controversies also appeared in drafting "the political statement", which led to the dealy of the publication of the agreed upon text by more than seven hours.

The main aim of the statement, which was imposed on the U.S. allies in Williamsburg, is to ensure to Washington conditions for deploying new American nuclear missiles by the end of 1983. To pacify the public opinion, in the statement there is a hypocritical declaration that "our arms will never be used except in response to aggression".

But is this is so, why then the United States so insistently refuses to follow the Soviet Union's example and to undertake the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. It is clear that the authors of the Williamsburg statement put their own meaning into the "aggression" notion, expecting that in certain conditions they will be able themselves to unleash aggression.

In words the authors of the statement declare for "lower levels of arms" and express "readiness to work with the Soviet Union to this purpose." But in deed, they put forward once again the U.S. proposal which was made in Geneva, the proposal aimed at getting unilateral military advantages. They insist, as before, that the only aim of the Geneva negotiations on limitation of medium-range nuclear means in Europe should be to "determine the level of deployment" of such forces.

The Williamsburg statement emphasises, as before, the categorical refusal "to include the forces of France and the United Kingdom". In practice that would signify the Soviet Union's consent to deployment of new American missiles and besides it will have to unilaterally reduce its missile medium-range armaments, with the similar armaments of the United States remaining intact.

Joining the deliberately unacceptable American proposals, the participants in the Williamsburg conference undermine the foundation for the quest of mutually acceptable decisions, based on the principle of equality and undiminished security. It is also indicative that such a notion as detente has been obliterated in full in the Williamsburg statement. Meanwhile, the interests of all peoples and states call for the return onto the path of detente -- political and military. Ignoring these rightful demands of the world public, the participants in the Williamsburg meeting oppose themselves to the interests of the whole of mankind.

Soltan Commentary

LD301729 Moscow World Service in English 1300 GMT 30 May 83

[Text] The Soviet Government has released a statement on nuclear disarmament at the present stage. Radio Moscow's Yuriy Soltan comments:

One thing must be immediately emphasized: the Soviet Government made it emphatic in its statement that it will continue to do everything possible to achieve a candid understanding on a reduction in nuclear arms, both strategic and medium-range, on the basis of equality and equal security. At the same time, the statement carries a serious warning to NATO countries, while the United States and those following in the wake of its policy keep pushing humanity to a nuclear catastrophe.

The administration in Washington has virtually been blocking strategic arms reduction talks with the Soviet Union. It keeps advancing various options to further whip up the strategic arms race in directions which it believes beneficial. The United States hold a similar position on the issue of limiting medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. It has been insisting on a solution according to which it will, at any rate, begin at the end of the year to mount new missiles in Western Europe in addition to the powerful nuclear weapons that NATO already has there. It seems the United States is not going to change its attitude.

At the Big Seven summit meeting in Williamsburg, the Reagan administration has imposed on the participants a so-called joint statement reaffirming the intent of Washington and NATO to deploy new generation American nuclear missiles in Western Europe. The authors of the statement flatly object to taking into account the nuclear forces of Britain and France. This alone makes an agreement impossible.

A United States policy of this kind increases the risk of a nuclear war that would jeopardize a l l without exception. This being the situation, the Soviet Union cannot but adopt effective measures to safeguard its security and that of its allies. The measures are discussed in a sincere and straightforward manner in the Soviet Government's statement. This is no threat. In the view of the Soviet Government, there is still time to stop the situation from dangerously turning for the worse. As a first step in this direction, the easiest and effective at the same time, the Soviet Union is suggesting again that until an understanding is reached on reducing nuclear armaments in Europe and strategic weapons as well [as] freezing these armaments quantitatively and limiting as much as possible their qualitative modernization. [sentence as heard]

The Soviet Government statement says all nations are dutybound to solve the urgent tasks of limiting and reducing armaments, nuclear first and foremost, and to get back to achieving less political and military tension.

TASS Military Analyst

LD301440 Moscow TASS in English 1426 GMT 30 May 83

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

Commenting on the statement, which has been issued at the Williamsburg meeting by the leaders of seven major capitalist states, on military problems and on "arms control", Western mass media describe it as a mere repetition of the positions held by the United States and its NATO allies in the past three and a half years.

The statement really contains a set of phrases usual for NATO leaders about plans to deploy the new U.S. missiles in Western Europe, about the unity of Western powers, about their striving to seriously conduct negotiations with the Soviet Union etc.

It is significant, however, that, unlike similar declarations in the past, the West European participants in the Williamsburg summit have apparently deemed it politically inadvisable immediately after the Soviet Government's statement of May 27, this year, to support President Reagan's absurd thesis that NATO, by building up arms and by preparing for deployment of new U.S. medium-range missiles in Western Europe, can ostensibly make the Soviet Union go to an agreement on American terms.

The Soviet Union in its statement is known to have warned the arms race advocates with utter clarity that the decision of the USA and NATO to start the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe, if it will be carried out, will force the USSR to reconsider the Soviet decision on the unilateral moratorium on the further deployment on medium-range systems in the European zone.

The need would also arise to implement, on arrangement with other Warsaw Treaty member countries, other measures as well to deploy additional means with the aim of creating the necessary counter-balance to the growing grouping of United States forward-based nuclear weapon systems in Europe and the nuclear arms of other NATO countries. It would be also necessary to take other reply measures with a view to the territory of the United States itself, the Soviet statement said.

The statement in Williamsburg, unfotunately, is not indicative of any shift in the Western countries' stand in the direction of realism and acceptance of the principle of parity and equal security of the sides.

As for the statement by the leaders of the Western "Seven" that their weapons "will never be used except in response to aggression," this gives rise to legitimate doubts. The USA stubbornly refuses to follow the Soviet Union's example and to assume an obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

Summit Adopts Communique

LD302115 Moscow TASS in English 2059 GMT 30 May 83

[Text] Williamsburg (Virginia) May 30 TASS -- The economic conference, attended by the heads of state and government of seven industrialised states of the West, has ended here today. After lengthy debate the conference adopted a concluding communique pompously called the Williamsburg Declaration on Economic Recovery, which was read out to journalists by President Ronald Reagan of the United States.

The communique demonstrated once again that the participants in the conference failed to overcome and even to substantially iron out the sharp differences existing between the industrialised countries of the West on the main economic and financial problems. It follows from the communique that the sides in effect have remained on their former positions on such key problems as ways of emerging from the economic crisis that has now encompassed the Western countries and created an army of 35 million unemployed.

The United States has actually prevented the solution of the question of the tremendous deficit of its state budget, high interest rates and the artificially high exchange rate of the dollar although this undermines the economic and financial position of other Western countries.

But at the same time the participants in the conference reached agreement on putting jointly economic and financial pressure on the developing countries, using for this their economic plight and tremendous debt to Western countries reaching 700 billion dollars.

It was announced here that the next meeting of the seven industrialized countries of the West will be held in Britain next year.

AFP: FOREIGN MINISTRY PROTESTS ON NEW U.S. EMBASSY

NC271734 Paris AFP in English 1724 GMT 27 May 83

[Excerpt] Moscow, May 27 (AFP) -- Soviet authorities have protested against "serious offences" committed by U.S. specialists working on the building site of the new embassy here, an authoritative Soviet source stated today. X-ray examinations of the building by U.S. specialists to locate listening devices set off a "strike" yesterday until June 20 by the 500 Soviet workers on the site.

A Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman stated today that the "Soviet Government drew the attention of the U.S. Embassy to the serious offences committed by U.S. specialists." They worked with cobalt-60 X-ray when Soviet workers were present, which was forbidden, and did not respect tolerated radiation levels, the spokesman added. The Soviet Government had warned the U.S. Embassy several times against the dangers of radioactive rays for Soviet workers on the site, he stated.

The United States had grossly infringed bilateral agreements on this matter as well as the obligation to guarantee full respect of Moscow's health regulations, the spokesman pointed out.

FLEET WORKERS UNION PROTESTS U.S. VISA REFUSAL

LD301903 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 30 May 83

[Text] The U.S. authorities have yet again perpetrated a discriminatory act with regard to Soviet trade unions, says a statement issued by the Maritime and River Fleet Workers Union Central Committee. The State Department has refused to issue visas to a delegation of the Soviet Trade union which was to have visited the United States at the end of May at the invitation of the U.S. East Coast branch of the International Longshoremen's Association. The trip would have been by way of a return visit; representatives of this branch visited the USSR in 1982.

The new violation by the Reagan administration of the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act creates additional barriers to the deveopment of mutual understanding between the working people of the USSR and the United States, to the implementation of a free exchange of opinions, the statement stresses. The Maritime and River Fleet Workers Union Central Committee has made a resolute protest in connection with this crude action by the Washington authorities.

REPRESENTATIVES OF U.S., USSR MEET IN MINNEAPOLIS

Trade Seminar Held

LD281033 Moscow TASS in English 1010 GMT 28 May 83

[Text] Minneapolis (Minnesota) May 28 TASS -- TASS special correspondent Oleg Polyakovskiy reports: The Reagan administration's shortsighted policy of reducing economic relations with the Soviet Union is detrimental to the United States itself. This is pointed out by the participants in the seminar on international trade, which was sponsored within the framework of the current conference of American and Soviet public on questions of disarmament and Soviet-American relations.

The economy of the United States suffers great losses because of the discriminatory restrictions on trade with the Soviet Union, said R. Clark, vice president of the "MTS Systems Corporation," which was hit by the consequences of the Administration's ban on the supplies of equipment to the USSR. The loss of Soviet orders, R. Clark pointed out, is conducive not only to losses suffered by American firms, but also to an increase in unemployment, as contracts stand for jobs.

It is wrong to think that the USA has a monopoly for high technology, stressed E. Salk, member of the American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council, president of the "Salk, Word and Salk Company." American companies willingly purchase Soviet technology. Thus, in particular, it was used to build the subway in Washington. Many corporations do business on the study of technological novelties of the USSR and the other socialist countries with the aim of using them in the West.

It is silly to harbour illusions that trade "sanctions" can be used to make the Soviet Union agree to concessions, undermine its economy or change its policy, E. Salk said. These illusions, he continued, are based on a wrong concept of the USSR. The Soviet Union is a major power. Since the fifties the average gross national product growth rate of the USSR has been considerably higher than that of the USA. The Soviet Union has vast natural resources, a skilled labour force. It can meet all of its requirements on its own.

The USSR has a healthy economy ensuring a permanent rise in the living standards of the Soviet people, said B. Saunders, vice president of the "Cargill Incorporated Company" which has for many years been engaged in mutually beneficial trade with the Soviet Union. The USSR is a reliable trade partner, while trust in American companies is undermined by the erratic U.S. policies.

The Soviet participants in the seminar pointed out that the present insignificant volume of trade turnover between the two countries is a direct result of Washington's striving to use trade as a means of bringing pressure to bear on the Soviet Union. As far as the USSR is concerned, it is always ready for the development of equal and mutually beneficial trade.

Joint Statement Adopted

LD301158 Moscow TASS in English 1127 GMT 30 May 83

[Text] Minneapolis (Minnesota) May 30 TASS -- By TASS special correspondent Oleg Polyakovskiy: At present, there is no task more important than stopping the arms race and establishing relations of mutual trust and cooperation between the USSR and the United States. This is unanimous opinion of the participants in a meeting of representatives of the Soviet and American public which has closed here.

The meeting was organised by the Washington Institute for Policy Studies jointly with the Union of Soviet Societies of Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries, the society "USSR-USA" and the Institute of USA and Canada at the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

"Having gathered together under the conditions of the worsening of Soviet-American relations and the apparent impasse at the official arms control talks, the meeting's participants examined a broad range of issues in the belief that new ideas may develop during open discussion on how to stop and reverse the arms race, improve international relations and relations between the United States and the Soviet Union and thus lessen the threat of war," says a joint statement adopted in Minneapolis.

This was a very useful meeting. Such contacts help develop mutual understanding between our peoples and the search for ways to eliminate nuclear arsenals, the TASS correspondent has been told by Marcus Ruskin, co-chairman of the Washington Institute for Policy Studies. He expressed the hope that the "Minneapolis meeting" will become an annual forum for constructive exchanges of views between representatives of the American and Soviet public. Speaking about the Reagan administration's attitude to the arms race, he pointed out that although the White House declares about its aspiration to put an end to it, facts attest to the contrary.

The U.S. President's determination to deploy MX missiles, his plans to station new medium-range nuclear systems in Europe and speed up the development of space weaponry are leading to another round in the arms race. New types of weapons do not help strengthen security. They only undermine the country's economy and bring into an impasse talks on terminating the arms race, Jerome Wisner, researcher from the Institute for Policy Studies, pointed out in his report. Further buildup of nuclear arsenals, he stressed, is madness, but the madness is continuing. The United States produced five new atomic warheads every hour of our meeting, said Ruth Adams, editor of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists.

American organizers of the meeting stress that although the U.S. Administration shows no interest in terminating the arms race and uses the very process of the arms control talks as a cover for deploying new, ever more dangerous systems of weapons, this does not mean that the struggle for disarmament has no future. The more American people become informed of the danger of the administration's course, the more persistently they demand an end to the arms race. Meetings, similar to this one, facilitate this process, the TASS correspondent has been told by representatives of the American delegation

FURTHER ON U.S. CONGRESS VOTE ON MX DEVELOPMENT

PM271501 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 May 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Correspondent V. Soldatov dispatch under the rubric "Topical Theme": "Contrary to Common Sense"]

[Text] New York [no date given] -- The U.S. Senate has approved by 59 votes to 39 the appropriation of $625 million for the further development and testing of the new MX ICBM nuclear weapons system. The House of Representatives had taken the same decision the day before by a majority of 53.

The result of the vote was very considerably influenced by a campaign conducted by the Administration over several months to "persuade" congressmen. The campaign also made broad use of traditional methods of influencing legislators such as invitations to lunch and dinner at the White House, private meetings with the President, advertising on the "need" to rearm America, and telephone calls to members of Congress from representatives of the business world who finance their election campaigns.

The congressmen's stance was also influenced by another tactic used by the White House: On the day the House of Representatives was to have discussed a resolution on appropriations for the pwoerful new missile the President published an article in THE WASHINGTON POST. The article was entitled "MX: The Key to Arms Reduction." The President appealed to members of the House of Representatives to vote for the MX missile, which he called a "Peacekeeper." R. Reagan asserted that the deployment of the MX, each of which will carry 10 nuclear warheads, would lead to a "balanced, controlled arms reduction and would help to ensure the security of the entire population of the world."

Such demagoguery suited many members of Congress. The vague promises by the head of the Administration to strive for arms reduction enabled them to appear as supporters of disarmament. By voting for the MX they seemed to be confirming their patriotism. This "dual stance" can to a considerable extent explain the seemingly incomprehensible fact that the House voted for MX soon after approving by a substantial majority a resolution on a nuclear arms freeze.

The Administration is very satisfied with the results of the voting in the House and the Senate. President R. Reagan has sent congressmen a letter in which he thanked Republicans and Democrats for their "wise and courageous step forward." But the battle between supporters and opponents of nuclear disarmament which began over the MX missile is still not over. The debates in Congress have shown that quite a few U.S. legislators realize that the White House promises to promote the reduction of nuclear potentials is at best a ruse and that those promises conceal the same old plans for a nuclear arms buildup. A number of congressmen have publicly promised to continue opposing the deployment of the new missile. The legislators' views may also be influenced by the population's feelings. Opinion polls show that a majority of Americans believe that the MX missile is a first-strike weapon.

HOUSE APPROVAL OF NEUTRON CHARGE FUNDS REPORTED

LD292244 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0850 GMT 29 May 83

[Text] Washington, 29 May (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Aleksandr Shalnev reports: Without any unnecessary noise, the U.S. House of Representatives Appropriations Committee has sanctioned the Reagan administration's request for additional allocation to the fiscal 1984 budget of around $50 million earmarked for the development and production of neutron charges for 155-mm artillery shells.

The new warhead charges will reinforce the already substantial U.S. neutron arsenal. According to data published in THE WASHINGTON POST, the United States already possesses around 300 neutron warheads for Lance missiles. Moreover, the production of 1,000 neutron charges for eight-inch guns is in full swing.

According to a confidential memorandum which the Administration attached to its request for additional allocations, it is proposed to deploy the neutron weapons now being produced on the territory of West European countries under the so-called program of modernization of NATO's nuclear forces. As we know, another key element in this program is the plan to deploy U.S. Pershing-II and cruise medium-range nuclear missiles in West Europe.

According to the paper's data, the countries on whose territory U.S. neutron weapons will be deployed have already been specifically determined. They are Great Britain, the FRG, and Italy, who are now developing the new FN-70 artillery guns, which take 155-mm shells. H. Roser, U.S. assistant secretary of energy, informed congressmen of this at a closed sitting of one of the subcommittees of the House of Representatives, THE WASHINGTON POST reported.

SPANISH FOREIGN MINISTER MORAN TO VISIT MOSCOW

Visit Previewed

LD271342 Moscow in Spanish to Spain 1900 GMT 27 May 83

[Text] The day after tomorrow, 29 May, Spanish Foreign Minister Fernando Moran will arrive in Moscow on an official visit. Our commentator Vladimir Malynin writes:

This visit to Moscow by a high-ranking Spanish representative is very opportune because it will favor the development of bilateral collaboration between the USSR and Spain in different areas, including political contacts at high level. The visit will enable to Soviet side to study with a representative of the Gonzales government the approach which the two sides take to key problems of the present situation in Europe and in the world as a whole with the aim of contributing to the maintenance of peace and the improvement of the climate in the European Continent.

The political dialogue between Soviet and Spanish leaders is not at all directed against others, but, on the contrary, it signifies a contribution to the growth of peace in Europe and throughout the world. This appraisal of the forthcoming visit follows from the Soviet Union's approach to its relations with Spain. Our country's policy is based on the Soviet desire to move along the path of the strengthening of peace and security in Europe and the whole world and to consolidate detente and promote broad international cooperation. The Soviet Union advocates beneficial and stable collaboration with Spain in all areas of mutual interest. This course is based on the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and on the growth of peace and the easing of international tension.

[Words indistinct] In Soviet-Spanish relations the way to (?use) the available (?resources) to improve mutual understanding and cooperation between the two countries is very important. Without doubt a contribution to this will be made by the agreement on the promotion of economic and industrial cooperation and maritime transport as well as the program of cultural and scientific exchange between the USSR and Spain for the 1984-85 period which is due to be signed when Fernando Moran is in Moscow.

In the promotion of contacts between the Soviet Union and Spain, Vladimir Malynin continues, a considerable role will be played, in our view, by the extension of the legal contractual basis of bilateral cooperation on matters such as visas, legal services, tourism, health and other questions. The [words indistinct] Soviet-Spanish contacts could be served by the significant and stable development of cultural exchange which helps the Soviet and Spanish peoples to better understand each other. The Soviet Union is willing to promote not only bilateral relations. It is in favor of cooperation with Spain for the sake of peace, and the strengthening of security in Europe and the whole world for the benefit of detente and disarmament. In order to achieve these objectives the Soviet side is ready to enter into the broadest cooperation with the Government, Parliament, business circles, cultural figures, and social organizations of Spain.

Mutual Relations Reviewed

PM310831 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 May 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by correspondent V. Vernikov: "USSR and Spain: On the Basis of Mutual Interests"]

[Excerpt] Madrid [no date given] -- At the very center of Madrid's elegant La Castellana Avenue, where in the spring saplings, planted by the competitors in the last world soccer championships, have begun to turn green on Friendship Alley, one of our Russian birch trees has also blossomed.

The saplings are still young and slender, but as the years pass by, full of strength and majesty they will embellish the heart of the capital with their crowns.

The comparison involuntarily comes to mind: The tree of Soviet-Spanish friendship is almost as young. The establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Spain in 1977 was the fertile soil which is nurturing this tree with its life-giving juices, although the roots of our two countries' ties go back centuries, to the remote past. The 40 years of Francoism could not cut them back despite the regime's fierce hatred for our country, its shameless anti-Soviet propaganda, and the desire to set our peoples against each other forever.

In the past 6 years it is as though we have become reacquainted, and with every passing day this mutual interest is growing in the most diverse spheres of human communication -- be it tourism, tours by Soviet or Spanish artistes, or the exchange of cultural works and sports delegations. There is no doubt that these contacts "work" to improve the overall climate of trust between our countries, giving concrete expression to the official documents on cultural, scientific, and technical cooperation.

The establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Spain has also made possible political contacts at summit level. The visits 4 years ago -- to Madrid by USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Gromyko and to Moscow by his Spanish counterpart -- created a basis for a serious and businesslike political dialogue, demonstrating mutual interest in developing mutually advantageous relations. The sides' positions coincide on by no means all international questions. However, useful contacts are effected between them. Broad trade and economic relations -- which so far, unfortunately, have not been developed, although favorable opportunities for this and the two sides' frequently voiced intentions do exist -- could be an important element in strengthening our ties.

In surveying today what has been achieved in a brief space of time we can say that a good foundation has been laid. In fact, cultural and scientific cooperation, enshrined in interstate agreements, has really been implemented for several years now. Perhaps not all projected plans have yet been achieved, but even what has been done proves convincingly that the intensification and expansion of this cooperation benefits both sides.

UPCOMING WEINBERGER VISIT TO FRG PREVIEWED

Deployment Timetable Delivered

LD272332 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1810 GMT 27 May 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] The news agencies report that Caspar Weinberger, U.S. secretary of defense, will arrive in Bonn in the next few days. They say he will bring a detailed schedule for the deployment of American nuclear missiles, which is to be finally ratified by the defense ministers of the NATO member-countries. In this connection the Bonn GENERALANZEIGER, a newspaper close to FRG Government circles, says: Listen please! The name of the American defense secretary not infrequently sounds in our country like the name of a fatally poisonous reptile. Weinberger's image is linked with the arms race -- which contradicts both common sense and political sense -- and with readiness for conflicts and a blind disdain for risk. This man is now arriving in Europe, the newspaper goes on. With Weinberger's arrival, the timetable drawn up by the headquarters for deployment of 108 Pershing-II's and 96 cruise missiles on the territory of the FRG will be put on FRG Defense Minister Woerner's desk. At the end of the year the nuclear warheads for the first missile batteries in the Nekar Valley will be delivered. So there you are.

And the United States is conducting negotiations in Geneva on limiting nuclear weapons in Europe and are even expressing feigned optimism about the outcome of these negotiations. And these representatives in Geneva keep coming out with all sorts of Reagan zero and interim options. All this is just for the public; to deceive. For, as the American CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR newspaper says, the political bosses surrounding the President in the White House have come to the conclusion that the reputation of a warmonger is not an advantageous one. They want to give Reagan some sort of new image. Such an excuse, however, the newspaper points out, would be convincing were it to be put into deeds. The deeds, however, remain as they were before, militaristic and provocative. The transatlantic reptiles are already setting about implementing in practice their fatally poisonous plans.

Reasons For Visit Viewed

LD291349 Moscow TASS in English 1254 GMT 29 May 83

[Text] Bonn May 29 TASS -- (from TASS correspondent) -- U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger arrives in Bonn today for a visit at the invitation of Manfred Woerner, the FRG's minister of defense. It has been announced that the U.S. defense secretary intends to get an idea of the combat efficiency of the West GErman Bundeswehr and of the training standards of its soldiers. With this end in view he is to tour a number of military facilities of the Bundeswehr as well as to exchange views in the FRG'S Ministry of Defense.

However, as is clear from West German press reports, the U.S. guest's visit goes far beyond the limits of a familiarization tour. It continues a series of the U.S. Administration's actions to put pressure on the FRG with a view to tighten still more the grip of the notorious "Atlantic solidarity" and to secure Bonn's unquestioning support for Washington's militarist course, including that in the question of realization of the ominous nuclear-missile decisions of NATO.

As the well-informed magazine DER SPIEGEL reported shortly before the visit, Caspar Weinberger will being to Bonn a detailed schedule for the deployment of the nuclear missiles. The essence of the document comes to the fact that the USA, without waiting for the outcome of the Geneva negotiations on limiting nuclear arms in Europe, the negotiations which, incidentally, the USA itself blocks by its non-constructive stand, intends to station its first-strike arms in the FRG and a number of other West European countries, whatever the cost. For this purpose the Pentagon has already done a vast amount of preparatory work. The "Weinberger plan" envisages that the first 18 "Pershing-2" missiles are to be manufactured already before the end of this year and brought from the USA to bases in the FRG by U.S. military aircraft.

'Heightened Pressure'

LD301835 Moscow TASS in English 1802 GMT 30 May 83

[Text] Bonn May 30 TASS -- Negotiations opened here today between the FRG Defence Minister Manfred Woerner and the chief of the Pentagon Caspar Weinberger, who came for a visit here. As it was announced, the U.S. defence secretary came to the FRG to have a notion of fighting ability of the West German Bundeswehr and the training of its troops. The visit is regarded here as yet another link in the campaign of Washington's heightened pressure on its allies to intensify militaristic preparations in the continent. The aims of Caspar Weinberger's trip become obvious from his interview which was printed in the newspaper DIE WELT today: To insist on realisation of the NATO'S nuclear missile plans, to cut short any resistance to these ominous designs, to press for support of the U.S. obstructionist stand at the Geneva negotiations.

It is not accidental that Caspar Weinberger made strong attacks on former Chancellor Helmut Schmidt who expressed doubts in public as to the seriousness of U.S. intentions at the Geneva negotiations.

As is clear from local press reports, the Washington emissary also intends to incline the West German side to still more active participation in American military ventures, to increase the burden of financial expenditures linked with the stay of U.S. troops in the FRG.

The detailed time-schedule of deployment of new medium-range nuclear missiles which Caspar Weinberger brought with him, the press points out, shows that those in Bonn and Washington who fanatically advocate deployment of missiles by no means strive for progress at the Geneva negotiations. The Ronald Reagan government is not interested in constructive results of negotiations. It seeks, cost what it may, to deploy in Western Europe its new nucelar missile means, putting before the Europeans the accomplished fact, stresses the statement which was issued today by the Presidium of the board of the German Communist Party. 1983 should not become the year of deployment of American nuclear missiles. This is why we protest against Caspar Weinberger's visit, it is emphasized in the document.

FRG OFFICIAL'S REMARKS ON PERSHING'S ATTAKED

LD281134 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0022 GMT 28 May 83

[Text] Moscow, 28 May (TASS) -- "Backing Washington's notorious 'zero' and 'interim' options, which are patently designed to create deadlock at the Geneva talks, the FRG Government simultaneously declares its readiness to deploy the new U.S. nuclear missiles on West German soil." The newspaper PRAVDA comes to this conclusion when commenting on the clumsy attempts by Juergen Moellemann, state minister at the FRG Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to misinform the FRG public with arguments on the harmlessness of the U.S. "Pershing II" nuclear missiles.

In declaring in the Springer newspaper DIE WELT that the "Pershing II" missiles are simply a harmless plaything, PRAVDA writes, Moellemann used the idea of presenting some kind of palliative to millions of his fellow citizens "who are beside themselves at the thought of the planned deployment of the new U.S. nuclear missiles in their country and its transformation into a hostage of the transatlantic strategists of a 'limited' and other versions of nuclear war."

Moellemann, PRAVDA notes, also writes that "Pershing II" is not some kind of terrible supernatural weapon. "But why does Mister Moellemann remain silent on what it is then? PRAVDA asks. Because, of course, the warhead on this missile is several times more powerful than that of the bomb dropped on Hiroshima!

Using such a balancing act, PRAVDA writes further, Moellemann endeavors to dispel the idea of "anyone" that "Pershing II" is a weapon of aggression. The author of the article swears that the U.S. brainchild " is not intended for inflicting a first strike."

This, in Moellemann's view, is because the range of these missiles is allegedly "so limited that they would not be suitable for inflicting a first strike on Moscow." But since when, PRAVDA asks, has the nature of a weapon been determined by this alone? And what about other centers "a bit nearer," by the way?

It is well known, the paper continues, that the "Pershing II" missiles only require a few minutes to reach the target and the flight time is one of the most important characteristics of a first-strike weapon.

These missiles are designed to cover long distances with a range of 2,500 km. Thus assertions concerning their "unsuitability" as a first-strike weapon and their "limited range" is a myth, an attempt to deliberately misinform the public.

Other passages by Moellemann also confirm this. He tritely heaps the blame on the Soviet Union. The article specifically says that by pointing out the dangers of the "Pershing-II missiles the Soviet Union allegedly "intends to reduce the population of the FRG to a state of fear." Why and with what aim, the Bonn politician does not even ponder. Moellemann simply fabricates some sort of "threatening hints" by the USSR about "making a preemptive strike." Surely the state minister cannot be unaware of what is well known to the entire world, PRAVDA writes in conclusion, namely that the USSR a year ago adopted a historic decision and pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

ZAMYATIN IN FRG FOR 'CULTURAL DAYS' FESTIVITIES

Meets Dortmund Officials

LD251324 Moscow TASS in English 1129 GMT 25 May 83

[Text] Dortmund May 25 TASS -- Prime Minister of North Rhine-Westphalia Johannes Rau and Dortmund Mayor Guenter Zamtlebe had a meeting here within the framework of the days of the Soviet Union with the leader of the Soviet delegation Leonid Zamyatin and the USSR's Ambassador in the FRG Vladimir Semenov.

Some questions of foreign policy and development of economic and cultural links were touched upon during the talk, which passed in a friendly atmosphere.

Comments on Disarmament Proposals

LD251318 Hamburg DPA in German 1149 GMT 25 May 83

[Text] Dortmund, 25 May (DPA) -- Neither the zero option nor an intermediate solution is an option for the USSR at the U.S.-USSR negotiations in Geneva. The proposals are aimed at stationing new missiles in Europe and unilaterally disarming the Soviet Union, said Leonid Zamyatin, member of the CPSU Central Committee, on 25 May in Dortmund. Both the zero option and an intermediate solution ignores the principle of equality and equal security, the politician said at the opening of the Dortmund cultural days abroad of the USSR.

Zamyatin confirmed the demand by the Soviet Union for the inclusion of French and British nuclear potentials in the Geneva negotiations. Because there are three NATO states but only the USSR of the Warsaw Pact that own nuclear weapons, equal numbers of nuclear weapons between the two blocs can only be achieved by including Britain and France. Europe does not need any new nuclear missiles because their number is already sufficient, Zamyatin emphasized. Those who are continously making a lot of noise about the Soviet threat are clearly only trying to hide their own striving for military superiority.

Zamyatin said that relations with the FRG continues to be greatly significant to the USSR. Cooperation between the two states is not only important in itself, but is also a significant stabilizing factor for Europe. In this context the Soviet Union is also expecting, in connection with the forthcoming visit by Chancellor Helmut Kohl, that cooperation would serve to strengthen "positive aspects of relations between both countries," the politician said.

Brandt Receives Zamyatin

LD271154 Moscow TASS in English 1042 GMT 27 May 83

[Text] Duesseldorf May 27 TASS -- Willy Brandt, chairman of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, [SDP] received here visiting Head of the Department of International Information of the CPSU Central Committee, Leonid Zamyatin.

During the meeting Willy Brandt and Leonid Zamyatin touched upon certain major international issues.

Views Exchanged

LD261748 Hamburg DPA in German 1703 GMT 26 May 83

[Text] Bonn, 26 May (DPA) -- Leonid Zamyatin, head of the CPSU Central Committee International Information Department, has expressed the fear that the Soviet-American negotiations on medium-range weapons in Geneva could end without any result. Zamyatin, who is staying in the Federal Republic for the Dortmund Cultural festival, said this on Thursday in Duesseldorf during an exchange of views with SPD chairman Willy Brandt.

According to the SPD in Bonn, Brandt put forward during the conversation the Social Democrats' views on how a limitation of nuclear arms could be achieved through measures by both sides and a catastrophic worsening of the international situation avoided. Zamyatin emphasized the significance that the Soviet leadership attaches to Chancellor Helmut Kohl's forthcoming visit to Moscow. Brandt expressed the hope that it will be possible to note as a result of this visit that the foundations created by the German-Soviet treaty of 1970 will be confirmed and, if possible, positively expanded.

Cultural 'Cooperation Plan' Signed

LD261908 Hamburg DPA in German 1503 GMT 26 May 83

[Text] Dortmund, 26 May (DPA) -- The cultural exchange between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic is to be safeguarded and increased in future. A "cooperation plan," signed by CPSU Central Committee Member Leonid Zamyatin and Walter Behrendt, president of the FRG-USSR societies, in Dortmund on Thursday will serve this objective. Zamyatin who is head of the Soviet delegation in Dortmund to attend the cultural days with foreign countries, is chairman of the USSR-FRG Society.

The "cooperation plan," which was concluded between the working group of the FRG-USSR Societies for the German side, the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, and the USSR-FRG Society for the Soviet side, is the seventh agreement of this type. It contains plans for cultural exchanges in the artistic and scientific areas between the two countries in 1983 and 1984.

After the signing ceremony, which was also attended by Vladimir Semenov, Soviet ambassador in Bonn, Zamyatin said that the agreement will help to strengthen trust between the Soviet and the German peoples. Both sides have the same objective. For the German contractual party, Behrendt emphasized that bilateral relations between the two states should, in view of the political situation, "not be reduced to the missile question." Cultural cooperation is a sign that the German as well as the Soviet side yearns for peace.

BRITISH PARLIAMENTARY ELECTION ISSUES DISCUSSED

Missile Deployment Issue

PM310843 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 May 83 First Edition p 5

[Article by Vladimir Shelkov under the rubric "Commentator's Column": "Election Battles"]

[Text] Preparation for the early general parliamentary elections scheduled for 9 June is in full swing in Britain. According to data from the country's Central Statistical Office, published in THE TIMES, on election day over 42 million inhabitants of the British Isles may go to the polls. The election manifestos of the rival parties have been submitted for their opinion.

The published documents show that the positions of the main participants in the campaign differ substantially. Under present conditions this is explained not only by the traditional antagonism of the Labor and Conservative Parties. The acuteness of the struggle has been determined, first, by Britain's unprecedentedly complex economic position, which is one of the results of the Conservatives' 4 year rule. At the same time, now that there is an urgent need to make a decisive choice between the policy of confrontation and arms race and the course toward curbing the danger of nuclear war, military policy issues have assumed a prominent place.

To judge from the Conservatives' manifesto, they intend to continue the militarist course linking Britain firmly with aggressive U.S. and NATO plans. The Tories' election document confirms their plans to deploy U.S. medium-range nuclear missile weapons on the country's territory.

Nor are the Tories abandoning their own nuclear ambitions. For instance, for the country's submarine fleet they intend to purchase from across the Atlantic the Trident-2 missile system which will increase the yield of their nuclear forces several times over. Meanwhile the government is rapidly modernizing Britain's existing nuclear potential. According to press reports the Polaris missiles with which four British submarines are equipped already carry a total of 336 warheads. After the completion of the modernization now underway their numbers will increase to 384. All this is part of the NATO preparations whose aim is to alter the correlation of forces in Europe in NATO's favor.

Criticizing the Tories' militarist program, Labor leader M. Foot noted at a press conference in London that if his party comes to power it will pursue a policy for the country's nonnuclear defense, seek a "freeze" on all types of nuclear arms, and review the question of the deployment of the U.S. cruise missiles. At an election meeting of the Communist Party of Great Britain, its secretary general, G. MacLennan stated that the U.S. and NATO missile plans increase the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war. The British Communists are going to the polls under the slogan "Work Instead of Bombs!"

Party Platforms Viewed

LD301952 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1145 GMT 28 May 83

[From "International Review" program presented by Viktor Mikheyev]

[Text] In Britain the campaign for the parliamentary election which will take place on 9 June, almost a year early, has continued over the past week. The Conservative government is hurrying to hold elections, assuming that in this way it will succeed in holding on to power. It is being noted that never in British history have the main rivals for power had such varied political programs.

The conservatives -- here is Thatcher setting out their program -- are planning to pursue a harsh economic courxe. [video shows Thatcher speaking] Labor promises an uplift in the economy and the living standard of the population, by a policy including the renunciation of the arms policy now being pursued by the Conservatives. Labor leader Michael Foot has said more than once that his party's main aim will be to refuse the deployment of cruise missiles on British territory. Labor is also proposing the idea of a non-nuclear strategy, and the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in central Europe as a first step in this direction. Michael Foot -- there he is now on your screens -- also promises to introduce at a very early stage a proposal making it possible to develop and effective agreement for a freeze on nuclear arsenals.

Over the past week protests by British peace supporters have continued against the anti-national, pro-American policy of the Conservative government, which is prepared to turn Britain into launching-pad for U.S. nuclear missiles.

NATO MILITARY EXERCISES IN TURKEY CRITICIZED

LD252314 Moscow TASS in English 2240 GMT 25 May 83

[Text] Moscow May 26 TASS -- PRAVDA describes today as a "provocative undertaking" military exercises to be held by NATO's southeastern command in Turkey's eastern regions bordering on the Soviet Union. These manoeuvres, as American opponents of the policy of detente and goodneighborliness boast at the NATO Headquarters, are designed as "deterrence" and are "unprecedented by their scale."

What has prompted another fit of war psychosis in the southeastern flank of the North Atlantic bloc near the borders with the USSR? PRAVDA asks. May be someone "threatens" Turkey? No, of course. Its present military leadership repeatedly, and in public characterised Soviet-Turkish relations as "traditionally goodneighbourly". Still fresh in memory is the January statement by President Kenan Evren in an interview with the newspaper AL-FAJIR about his country's striving for development of friendly relations with the Soviet Union, based on the principles of goodneighbourliness and peace. It is well known that the USSR implements these principles.

It is obvious, PRAVDA writes, that the Pentagonites are eager to "scare" our country from Turkish territory for reasons which are directly opposite to the national interests and securityof the USSR's southern neighbour. It seems that fears by some prominent Turkish observers who predicted that broader military cooperation with the United States threatens to involve Turkey into dangerous whirlpools are beginning to materialise. Prospects of the appearance on its soil of punitive-interventionist "rapid deployment forces", automatically oriented, according to U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, at oil-fields, are becoming clearer.

The Pentagon also plans to station American medium-range nuclear weapons in Turkey, the commentary stresses. The U.S. growing military presence in Turkey, the newspaper MILLIYET noted recently, gives cause for legitimate alarm to the Turkish public. Turkey's policy, the newspaper wrote, should be well-weighted and balanced, taking into account its own national interests, calling for friendly contacts with its neighbours and preserving traditional relations of good-neighbourliness with the Soviet Union.

GROMYKO RECEIVES IRANIAN AMBASSADOR 27 MAY

LD271340 Moscow TASS in English 1330 GMT 27 May 83

[Text] Moscow May 27 TASS -- Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, today received in the Kremlin the Ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Iran in the USSR K. Tabataba'i at the latter's request.

During their conversation they discussed questions of mutual interest.

U.S.-ISRAELI ACTION IN LEBANON SCORED

LD271607 Moscow TASS in English 1536 GMT 27 May 83

[Text] Moscow May 27 TASS -- TASS commentator Grigoriy Vasiliyev writes:

Addressing members of the American association of foreign policy, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz said that if Syria did not withdraw its troops from Lebanon their presence would eventually lead to the division of the country.

The statement of the U.S. secretary of state shows that Washington is trying to distort the actual state of things. The division of Lebanon, its complete subjugation to U.S.-Israeli diktat was one of the principal aims of the barbaric Israeli aggression against the people of Lebanon and Palestine. This is precisely the aim of the notorious "peace accord" imposed on Lebanon. "Security zones" in west and south Lebanon for which the accord calls come as a clear encroachment on the right of the Lebanese Government to exercise its legitimate powers over the entire territory of the country.

Not only do these zones fail to guarantee the security of 400,000 Palestinians living in Lebanon, they also enable the aggressor to stage large-scale punitive and repressive operations with the aim of establishing their own "order" in the occupied lands.

The real worth of the assurance of U.S. envoys concerning the "guarantees of security" for the Palestinians and the Lebanese people will be seen from the massacres in Palestinian Sabra and Shatila camps which were staged with the knowledge of the United States and claimed the lives of thousands of innocent civilians -- women, old people and children.

The Israeli occupation of Lebanon, and escalating U.S. military presence in Lebanon are turning that Arab country into a springboard for future aggressive attacks the purpose of which is to support Israeli expansionist policy, satiate imperial ambitions of Washington.

As to the position of Syria, it seems appropriate to recall that the Syrian side has repeatedly stressed its readiness to pull out its troops from Lebanon provided Israeli aggressors withdrew unconditionally from there in compliance with the corresponding resolutions of the United Nations Security Council. All this shows that the case in point is not the alleged "intransigence" of Damascus but the need of an early and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from the territory of Lebanon in compliance with resolutions Nos 508 and 509 of the U.S. Security Council which reflects the will of the world community.

This is precisely the road toward normalising the situation around Lebanon, ensuring its sovereignty, territorial integrity, independence and Arab identity of that country.

LEBANESE, SYRIAN TENSION SAID ESCALATING

PM310940 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 28 May 83 p 3

[Political observer Sergey Losev article under the rubric "A View of Events": "The Near East: Stop the Threat to Peace"]

[Text] Alarming news has again been arriving from Lebanon in recent days. The Israeli occupation army is openly preparing for an attack on Syrian military contingents belonging to the inter-Arab peacekeeping forces in Lebanon. With a view to making a piratical strike against Syria, several Israeli tank divisions have been sent into the Al-Biqa' Valley. Israeli aircraft have increased the frequency of provocative flights over Syrian positions.

In this tense situation the U.S. Admininstration is acting with such irresponsibility that you would not think it was a great power and a permanent member of the Security Council, obliged under the UN Charter to show concern for maintaining international peace.

Israeli Prime Minister Begin has been invited to the United States to further coordinate Washington and Tel Aviv plans within the framework of the American-Israeli strategic alliance. At the same time the Pentagon has announced the resumption of deliveries of 75 F-16 jet fighter-bombers to Israel. As the French newspaper LE PARISIEN LIBERE notes, "in effect this decision frees Begin's hands and could ultimately encourage Israel to enter into armed conflict with Syria."

As a result of American-Israeli intrigues the real danger is emerging of a new war in the Near East, and serious responsibility for its grave consequences rests with the U.S. Administration. The course of events in the region in the first 10 days after the signing of the Lebanese-Israeli agreement has confirmed that it has not brought the region the promised peace and tranquillity and has only exacerbated the explosive situation in the Near East.

The initiators of this separate deal, created by the United States in the image and likeness of Camp David, give assurances that the agreement is in accord with Lebanon's national interests. In fact the agreement violates Lebanon's sovereignty, independence, and territorial intergrity, and is a flagrant encroachment on the Lebanese government's right to exercise its legitimate powers throughout the country's territory. This unequal agreement, signed under U.S. pressure under conditions in which Israel continues to occupy a considerable section of Lebanese territory, rewards the aggressor for the invasion of Lebanon and creates preconditions for dismembering the country and turning it into a satellite of the United States and Israel.

A so-called "security zone" is being create in southern Lebanon where the occupiers and subunits of the Israeli puppet, Major Haddad, will continue to hold sway. Let us note that the security zone is being created on one side of the border -- on Lebanese territory alone -- so only Israel's security is being considered, although, as is well known, the victim of aggression was not Israel, but Lebanon.

Many prominent Lebanese politicians have sharply condemned the agreement. The American-Israeli conspiracy against Lebanon, former Prime Minister R. Karami noted, is aimed at bringing that Arab state into the Camp David orbit. W. Junblatt, chairman of the Central Political Council of the National Patriotic Forces of Lebanon, noted that the Lebanese-Israeli agreement is an encroachment on Lebanon's independence and marks the start of the dismemberment of that Arab country. He noted that the deal imposed on Lebanon consolidates the Israeli presence in the south of the country as well as the activity of rightwing Christian formations in that region.

Shaykh Muhammad (Ali-al-Dzhozu), mufti of mountain Lebanon, stated that the agreement "is nothing more than a fraudulent trick by Washington and Tel Aviv. The existence of a Lebanese-Israeli agreement does not mean that Israel will stop its actions aimed at undermining and dismembering Lebanon's national unity."

It is noteworthy that in the Israeli-occupied zone armed clashes have now resumed between the Druzes and Maronite Christians. It is a question of deliberate attempts to kindle enmity between the communities with a view to creating a pretext for prolonging the Israeli occupation and keeping in Lebanon indefinitely the American Marines brought there under the flag of the so-called international forces.

Whereas, formerly, high-ranking spokesmen for the U.S. Administration gave assurances that the American military contingent would be withdrawn from Lebanon by the end of 1982, now they do not even hint at a schedule for withdrawing the Marines. On the contrary, there is talk of further increasing the numerical strength of American units in Lebanon and establishing them at Lebanese bases. American imperialism is trying to gain maximum benefit from the consequences of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. "Again and again we create military facts on the ground which the United States can turn into political achievements," S. Dinitz, former Israeli ambassador to Washington, argued cynically. "East Israeli attack is an invitation to the United States to act as peacemaker." It was this role of "peacemaker" which the U.S. Administration played after the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, passing itself off as a "defender" of Arab interests and an "impartial intermediary" between Israel and the Arab countries. This "mediation" goes against the Arab East's vital interests every time. That happened in the period of talks concluding the Camp David deal. It happened with the agreement on conditions for the withdrawal of Palestinian military formations from Beirut: on that occasion the United States guaranteed the Palestinians' security and then, under cover of these U.S. guarantees, the Israelis perpetrated the monstrous slaughter of Palestinians in the Sabra and Shatila camps. It happened at the talks on concluding a Lebanese-Israeli agreement. The U.S. Secretary of State's so-called mediation mission amounted in essence to exerting massive pressure on the victim of Israeli aggression -- Lebanon. As a result an agreement was signed which is incompatible with UN Security Council resolutions demanding the unconditional, total withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanese territory.

In a protocol to the agreement and in a separate, secret American-Israeli document, the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon's territory is made dependent on the departure of Palestinian military formations from Lebanon and of the Syrian contingent of the inter-Arab peacekeeping forces which entered the country on a decision of the Arab League and with the Lebanese Government's consent. No guarantees are given for the security of Syria and the 400,000 peaceful Palestinian citizens who have found themselves in Lebanon as refugees. And this after what happened at Sabra and Shatila!

As Syrian Foreign Minister 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam noted, Syria "is prepared to withdraw its military contingent from Lebanese territory immediately, provided the Israeli occupation troops are withdrawn from there unconditionally," which Tel Aviv is not about to do. The Syrian Government has therefore categorically rejected the Lebanese state's territory into a bridgehead for aggressive actions by imperialism and Zionism.

Syrian President Hafiz al-Assad has reaffirmed that Syria fully supports the position of Lebanon's national patriotic forces which are waging a struggle against attempts to deprive Lebanon of sovereignty and isolate it from the Arab world. Syrian Prime Minister 'Abd ar-Ra'uf al-Kasm has noted that at present all the country's efforts are aimed at rebuffing the danger of new Israeli aggression which hangs over Syria. The Syrian head of government assessed highly the support given the Syria by the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries.

American Zionist propaganda, pursuing a campaign of psychological pressure, is trying to create the false impression that the Arab world supports the Lebanese-Israeli agreement and that Syria is isolated. Although certain conservative Arab regimes prefer to remain silent, Washington is clearly passing off its wishes as reality. The majority of Arab states, in particular Libya, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Algeria, Kuwait, Iraq, and opposition parties in Egypt, have condemned the Lebanese-Israeli agreement. Mass demonstrations of solidarity with the Lebanese and Syrian peoples' struggle against Israeli aggression and the capitulatory agreement are currently taking place in many Arab capitals. In the occupied territories armed resistance to the aggressors is growing and the flame of guerrilla struggle is spreading. The atmosphere there is extremely tense and the Arab population will not tolerate the interventionists' tyranny. The Arab countries have considerable potential for thwarting the aggressors' plans.

There is a growing conviction in the Arab East that in the present complex situation the priority task for national patriotic forces is to further step up the struggle against Israeli aggression, and for the unconditional, immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon and all the occupied Arab territories. The unanimously adopted UN Security Council decision demanding the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops must be fulfilled. American Marines must also be taken out of Lebanon. They have no business on Lebanese soil.

The Soviet Union consistently advocates a united Lebanon, the restoration of its sovereignty, and the safeguarding of its independence and territorial integrity.

The serious warning contained in the Soviet Government statement to the effect that it is time Tel Aviv stopped playing with fire remains in force. The Soviet Union again stresses that the legitimate rights and interests of all the Near East peoples can be ensured not by force of arms, not through war, but only with the help of political efforts by all interested parties and through an all-embracing, just settlement.

U.S., ISRAEL PREPARE 'AGGRESSION' AGAINST SYRIA

Military Actions Noted

PM300931 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 83 First Edition p 5

[R. Moseyev dispatch: "Preparing Aggression: The Intrigues of Tel Aviv and the United States Against Syria"]

[Text] Artillery, armored transports, tanks -- yesterday all this was moving up in an endless stream from Israel towards the Al-Biqa' Valley. This intensive redeployment of Zionist forces followed fast on the heels of Tel Aviv's announcement that the army had been placed in full combat readiness.

Beirut newspapers write with alarm today that, judging by everything, Israel has embarked on the final stage of preparation for military actions against Syria. This is also demonstrated by the bellicose nature of the statements emanating from Tel Aviv and Washington in the last few days. Their meaning amounts to the fact that war with Syria is "inevitable" and that the Syrians, who have refused to subscribe to the notorious Lebanese-Israeli "peace agreement," "must" be made to do so by force.

Typical in this respect is yesterday's statement by Israeli Defense Minister Arens. Making out that black is white, he accused Syria of "fueling tension" and demanded that Damascus withdraw its subunits from the northern sector of Al-Biqa' -- where, as is known, they are stationed in accordance with an Arab League mandate. Moreover, the general acknowledged that, despite the existing "peace agreement," Israel will not pull out of the occupied Lebanese territory; the very posing of this issue is, in his words, "illogical."

Attention is also being drawn here to the now frequent visits by high-ranking U.S. military officials whose appearance observers are linking with the escalation of militarist preparations. General Robert Barrow, commander of the U.S. Marines, arrived in Lebanon yesterday on an "inspection visit." The commander of the U.S. 6th Fleet, Admiral Rowden, and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, John Vessey, were here prior to this. It ought to be added that, according to reports from Washington, another U.S. naval task force is heading for Lebanon's shores. All this, today's papers write, attests that large-scale aggression against Syria is under preparation.

Situation 'Aggravated'

LD302157 Moscow TASS in English 1935 GMT 30 May 83

["Israel Aggravates the Situation" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS -- TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

Twelve hundred U.S. marines have arrived in Beirut in replacement of the same number of homebound servicemen from among the disengagement force. Actually these are contingents of the notorious U.S. "Rapid Deployment Force" intended for creating jumping-off grounds and for mounting military operations in regions which are situated thousands of kilometres away from the USA.

A big U.S. naval armada is constantly near the shores of Lebanon. A build-up of Israeli troops in Lebanon's east, where Israeli tank columns have advanced farther northward, is going on at the same time. Reports coming from Lebanon indicate that tension at the line of contact between Syrian and Israeli troops in the Al-Biqa' Valley as well as in the area of the Israeli-occupied Syrian Golan Heights is growing with every passing day. To provoke Syrian troops, the Israeli aggressors have repeatedly violated the ceasefire agreement in the past twenty-four hours.

Noteworthy is the fact that the new phase of the aggravation of the situation by Tel Aviv both in Lebanon and in the entire region began immediately after the signing of the Israeli-Lebanon agreement imposed on Lebanon. The French newspaper LES ECHO points out today in this connection that underlying the explosive situation which is now forming is precisely this agreement which instead of promoting peace has led to the establishment of a pre-war situation between Syria and Israel. It is clear already now, the Japanese ASHAI SHIMBUN stated as well, that the agreement with Israel has by no means taken the strain off the situation in Lebanon and that a new burst of tension can be expected.

Judging from how impudently the Tel Aviv leaders conduct themselves, Israel intends to use the concluded agreement for the prolongation of its occupation of Lebanon. Syria is known to have condemned the agreement imposed on Beirut, and demands immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all troops of the Israeli aggressors from Lebanon.

Such a stand of Syria and the negative attitude of most Arab countries towards the U.S.-Israeli collusion on Lebanon arouse undisguised exasperation in Washington and Tel Aviv. This is why there is open talk in the USA and Israel about preparation for an attack on Syria within the framework of the "strategic cooperation" agreement existing between them. Just think, the Reagan administration and Tel Aviv leaders in every way praise the Israeli-Lebanese "peace agreement" and at the same time are preparing a new war in the region to make the Arabs submit to the "agreement". Is not it an evidence that when the Reagan administration and Tel Aviv leaders hypocritically talk of peace, in actual fact they intensively prepare new military ventures against Arab peoples. Peace which should be asserted by means of guns is not peace at all but is a vertitable war. The establishment of a genuine peace in the whole of the Middle East should be started not with launching a new armed conflict against another Arab country, as Washington and Tel Aviv intend to do, but with a withdrawal of Israeli aggressors from Lebanon and from all Israel-occupied Arab territories.

USSR, WPC PUBLICLY CONDEMN RSA MAPUTO RAID

TASS Statement

LD271006 Moscow TASS in English 0940 GMT 27 May 83

["TASS Statement" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 27 TASS -- The Soviet Union, in common with other countries of the world, has received with indignation the news of a fresh crime perpetrated on May 23 by the racist Pretoria regime, whose Air Force made a barbarous raid on a suburb of Maputo, the capital of the People's Republic of Mozambique. The fresh provocative sortie has once again demonstrated the aggressive ambitions of the South African racist regime, which is bent on putting the freedom-loving people of Mozambique and the other peoples of southern Africa on their knees, subordinating them to its diktat, making them give up support for the legitimate struggle by the African people of the Republic of South Africa against the apartheid system, which has been condemned by the UN and the world community as a crime against humanity.

Also visible in the barbarous action launched by the racists is their reaction to the determination of the people of Mozambique to proceed along the path of social transformations and strengthening their homeland's independence. The statements by the Pretoria authorities, in particular by the South African defence minister, which was made on the day when the racist air pirates made the raid on Maputo, contain an open threat that such actions will further be taken "any time and in any place." Thus the racists further intend to threaten peace and security of the peoples of the African Continent, by building up tensions and aggravating the situation in the region.

The criminal action by the racist regime of the Republic of South Africa against Mozambique would have not been launched, had that regime not relied for support on the imperialist forces, above all on the United States. Noteworthy is the striving of some circles in the West to justify the armed aggression of the Pretoria regime against Mozambique and other African states. An attempt is made at putting on a level the just struggle of the peoples of southern Africa against the apartheid regime and the aggressive actions of the racists, by using as a cover empty phrases about "tragic events" of the recent times in southern Africa.

The Soviet Union considers it necessary to declare once again its solidarity with the People's Mozambique, its invariable support for the Mozambican people in their indomitable struggle against the forces of imperialism, colonalism, and racism.

WPC Issues Statement

LD271923 Moscow TASS in English 1011 GMT 27 May 83

[Text] Helsinki May 27 TASS -- The World Peace Council [WPC] has issued a statement here condemning on behalf of hundreds of millions people in 137 countries of the world the raid of the South African Air Force on a suburb of Maputo. This act of terrorism and aggression against a sovereign and independent date is proof of the fact, the statement says, that the mounting struggle of the people of South Africa under the leadership of the African National Congress has placed the racist regime of the Republic of South Africa into a hopeless position. The World Peace Council is expressing its full support for the just struggle of the African National Congress for the country's freedom and national independence, and declares its solidarity with the government and heroic people of Mozambique and of the other "frontline" states of southern Africa. The WPC calls upon all peace forces, all who declare for national liberation and democracy to condemn the aggressive acts of the racist regime of the Republic of South Africa and its attempts at destabilizing the situation in the neighbour countries.

U.S. WHITE PAPER ON CENTRAL AMERICA SCORED

LD281100 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2050 GMT 27 May 83

[Text] Washington, 28 May (TASS) -- The U.S. State Department published on Friday another white paper on Central America in which another clumsy attempt is made to "certify" "subversion" by the Soviet Union, Cuba, and Nicaragua on the continent.

As in previous cases, this is a primitive compilation of documents and other "proofs," obviously fabricated with the aid of the CIA, that the intensification of national liberation in El Salvador is grounded not in the explosion of discontent of the peoples of the country, driven to despair by poverty and lack of rights, but by the "intrigues of international communism."

The State Department fabrication is nothing but a propaganda cover for Washington's adventuristic course directed at restoring the undivided supremacy of the United States in Central America.

STONE'S ROLE AS C.A. 'MEDIATOR' QUESTIONED

LD281048 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 28 May 83

[Text] In Washington the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee has approved the nomination of former Senator Richard Stone as special U.S. Presidential representative in Central America.

This is not just a matter of a simple promotion of some American official, writer on international affairs Aleksandr Baryshev notes. According to the official story, Stone's duties include searching for a constructive political solution to the conflicts in the area. He is allegedly supposed to help start talks between the Salvadoran authorities and the rebels, and between Nicaragua and Honduras. Yet it was this same Stone who, while he was a Senator, presented himself as one of the most fervent supporters of the aggressive U.S. line against Cuba. He initiated the slanderous campaign unleashed in 1979 over the imaginary concentration of Soviet forces in Cuba. The U.S. press has reported on his close ties with the fascist regime in Guatemala, for whom he was a paid lobbyist.

The true mission of this "mediator," if that is what he may be called, is evident. It is to do everything he can to wreck any talks that may start in the region. Such talks are on the agenda. The Salvadoran patriots have spoken out in favor of them, Nicaragua proposes talks, and influential forces in Latin America are in favor of holding talks.

A group of countries known as the Contadora Group -- Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, and Panama -- is now striving to bring about a political dialogue between the countries and conflicting sides in the area. This dialogue, however, goes radically contrary to the policy of Washington, which is banking on solving problems by force. In order to step up its military aid to the dictatorial regimes, however, the White House needs pretexts. It is well known that the U.S. public and many congressmen condemn the growing U.S. interference in Central America.

It is Richard Stone who is to prepare such a propaganda ruse. He wants to prove that, because of the supposed unwillingness of the Sandinist government and the Salvadoran partisans, despite the alleged good will of the governments of El Salvador and Honduras and the peacemaking efforts by Reagan's envoy, the possibilities for a political settlement are exhausted.

MOSCOW VIEWS SHUFFLE OF U.S. OFFICIALS

LD302319 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 30 May 83

[From "International Diary" program presented by Vitaliy Sobolev]

[Text] Now let us turn to events in Central America. The latest events in this area show particularly clearly just how the political course of the United States and of the overwhelming majority of other countries in the Western Hemisphere have crossed there, courses moving in different, if not to say opposite, directions. Washington is now carrying out a shake-up of the officials who are directly engaged in Central American affairs. Enders, assistant secretary of state for inter-American affairs, and Hinton, ambassador to El Salvador, are being sent into retirement. Instead a new figure is making his appearance: Stone, President Reagan's representative in Central America.

It is clear why they have removed Hinton: Someone has to carry responsibility for the fact that dictatorship is suffering one defeat after another, despite millions in American support. They have made Enders, too, something of a scapegoat. He is blamed for the failures of U.S. policy in this region and for the fact that this policy is not supported in Congress, although Enders, of course, is more someone who carries out rather than formulates policy. As far as Congress' attitude is concerned, the U.S. President has more than once taken it upon himself to advocate American interference in Central America, and has done so loudly on Capitol Hill. In fairness, therefore, he should share the failure in Congress with Enders.

Interesting, Enders is being blamed in official Washington circles for allegedly being inclined to enter into contact with the Salvadoran rebels. The curious thing here is the fact that Stone has been put forward, supposedly, to assist in talks between the sides in conflict in Central America, including El Salvador. So the retirement of Enders exposes once again the genuine intentions of the United States which Stone has to implement: those of frustrating talks in any form, of making the crisis yet more acute, and of justifying a hardening of the American course. A hardening, that is how foreign observers unanimously evaluate the correction to American policy which has given rise to the present shake-up of officials. The countries of Latin America want neither a hardening nor an aggravation of the situation in Central America. They view talks as the way out.

The completion of the work of a conference of nine foreign ministers in Panama was set for Monday. It was there, on the island of Contadora, that an initiate was conceived, the main meaning of which is talks, and it is there that they are now trying to bring it to practical fulfillment. Great hopes are scarcely justified. Taking part in the conference are representatives of Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador, and they carry out orders from Washington with even more willingness than Enders did and than Stone will do.

But it is obvious that an opinion of Latin America as a whole has been formed, and it differs radically from the wishes of the U.S. Government. The name of Negroponte does not appear in the current Washington list of movements by officials. He is the American ambassador in Honduras, and it is from there that he has been leading the undeclared war against Nicaragua. Without doubt, the aggression against this country will bring Negroponte neither military laurels nor a political career. The question is this: When will they remove him as being yet another who has failed to cope?

U.S. MILITARY ACTIVITIES IN EL SALVADOR NOTED

Military Advisers' Role

LD271547 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 27 May 83

[Text] According to reports from El Salvador, an American military adviser, Naval Commander Albert Schaufelberger, has been killed there. Viktor Olin has this comment:

The American Defense Department has confirmed the fact and made haste to specify that Schaufelberger was assassinated in the capital San Salvador. A spokesman for the Pentagon said there are as many as 50 American military advisers in El Salvador and they abide by instructions not to approach the combat zone and not to take part in the hostilities. Offering such explanations, the American military department sought to deflect charges levelled at it because of the role which American servicemen play in Salvadoran developments. According to a congressional sanction their number should not exceed 55 and all their functions are to train and consult government troops.

But despite the shroud of secrecy, facts come to light now and then to show that these restrictions are violated. Such was the situation a few months ago when an American military adviser was wounded in the combat zone. The incident set off a wave of protest toward the Americans [word indistinct] were repeating what they did in Vietnam. Quite recently fresh facts came out indicating a deep United States involvement in the Salvadoran war. It became known that a group of top secret Pentagon workers has been operating for a long time behind the backs of the military advisers used as a screen. Their job is not only to prepare and carry out combat and punitive operations by government troops, acts of sabotage, and intelligence, their job is also to influence the political apparatus of the ruling regime.

A new secret service guides the activities of those persons. Set up within the Department of Defense, its name is the Army Intelligence Support Activity. Its organizers have such a strong stake in top secrecy that they overstep the law, failing to inform special congressional bodies about the new service and obtain permission. [sentence as heard] The number of workers sent to El Salvador and to other countries is under wraps too, but what we do know about the new organization is but the tip of the iceberg. By sending its military advisers to El Salvador and to other Central American countries together with secret agents, the Pentagon is steering toward open military interference in the region.

Washington leaders are ever more outspoken on the matter. The official explanation is a concern about American vital interests and protection against what is termed as world communism. But the views of American citizens are poles apart. An absolute majority, as indicated by the latest public opinion polls, believe the interests of their country are not threatened by some mythical communist schemes in Central America. The real threat comes from the plans of the Reagan administration to use armed force there.

Training of Salvadoran Troops

LD272329 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 27 May 83

[Text] Our correspondent in Central America, Igor Goranskiy, reports: The first group of Salvadoran cadets has arrived at the U.S. Army's Fort Benning in Georgia. They will attend a training course on carrying out military operations in guerrilla warfare conditions. In all, 520 servicemen from El Salvador will undergo training at this base. U.S. instructors will teach the Salvadoran cadets tactical patrol and search operations, and the use of modern weapons at combat subunit level.

Not restricting itself to deliveries to El Salvador of huge quantities of arms, military aircraft, helicopters, and other means of transport, valued at hundreds of millions of dollars, and having undertaken to equip practically the whole of the punitive Salvadoran army, the U.S. Government has now earnestly set about the wholesale retraining of Salvadoran officers along U.S. lines.

Further on Cadets' Training

LD281557 Moscow World Service in English 1300 GMT 28 May 83

[Excerpts] A spokesman for the Pentagon has announced that soon 500 soldiers from the Salvadoran Army will arrive at Fort Benning, in Georgia, for accelerated military training. Now comments on that from Leonid Levchenko:

News agencies speculate that this rush to train the Salvadoran Army in the arts, so-called, of terror and murder, reflects Washington's dissatisfaction that the troops of the puppet regime are increasingly being defeated by the patriots. In the first 4 months of this year the units of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front killed 2,000 punitive troops, captured over 700 soldiers, and seized large numbers of weapons and equipment. The prisoners are treated humanely by the patriots and are allowed to go free. However, the punitive troops trained by American so-called advisers are certainly not humane to the civilians.

Meanwhile, President Reagan is talking about the successes of the so-called democracy in that country. Apparently Washington is seeking graveyard pacification there just to maintain the dictatorial regime that suits the United States.

'SECRET' U.S. GUATEMALAN EXPANSION NOTED

LD291200 Moscow TASS in English 1115 GMT 29 May 83

[Text] New York May 29 TASS -- As the NBC television network has reported, a new long-term secret strategic plan has been worked out in the White House envisaging the sending of a considerable group of U.S. military advisers to Guatemala. The NBC pointed out, with reference to an official spokesman of the White House, that under the plan the group will comprise 75-80 advisers specializing in training in anti-guerrilla warfare methods. The NBC stressed that the new strategic plan will lead to a substantial expansion of the U.S. Armed Forces' interference in the region.

The sanguinary Guatemalan regime is one of those odious dictatorships which the Reagan administration counts on in its Central American policy. The military and police machinery of that country does not cease mass terror and repressions. According to the data of the Guatemalan opposition, the punitive troops killed more than 10.000 people since March last year alone. Indians, the native people of Guatemala, are the first to fall victim to the cruellest tortures and killings. The U.S. press has repeatedly published documentarian evidence of monstrous massacres.

However, Washington, possessed with the idea of "containing the communist menace" in Central America, shuts the eye to those crimes of the Guatemalan military for the sake of keeping in power the regime suitable to it. Early this year the White House lifted an embargo on military deliveries to Guatemala, and the bloody regime received U.S. military aid to the tune of ten million dollars. At present, in keeping with the newly-elaborated secret plan, the military support for the odious dictatorship will be expanded.

CPSU POLITBURO MEMBER PELSHE DIES 29 MAY

Announcement of Death

PM301408 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 31 May 83 p 1

["From the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers" -- SELSKAYA ZHIZN headline]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the USSR Council of Ministers announce with profound grief that Arvid Yanovich Pelshe, prominent figure of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet deputy, and twice Hero of Socialist Labor, died 29 May 1983, aged 84, after a serious illness.

[Signed] CPSU Central Committee; USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; USSR Council of Ministers

Medical Statement Released

PM301455 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 31 May 83 p 2

["Medical Conclusion on the Illness and Cause of Death of Arvid Yanovich Pelshe" -- SELSKAYA ZHIZN headline]

[Text] A.Y. Pelshe, born in 1899, suffered from lung cancer. The course of the illness was complicated by pulmonary atelectasis and by increasing phenomena of pulmonary and cardiac insufficiency. Death came at 0555 on 29 May 1983 in connection with a cardiac arrest. The diagnosis was fully confirmed during a patho-anatomical investigation.

[Signed] Professor Y.I. Chazov, chief of the USSR Health Ministry Fourth Main Administration and academician of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences; Prof N.N. Malinovskiy, academician of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences; Prof V.G. Popov, honored figure of science; Prof A.G. Chuchalin, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences; Prof M.I. Perelman, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences; Dr of Medical Sciences I.V. Martynov; A.Y. Zavarnova, the treating doctor; and G.D. Levitskaya, chief of the Patho-anatomical Department

Obituary Published

PM301518 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 31 May 83 p 2

[Obituary of Arvid Yanovich Pelshe]

[Text] Twice Hero of Socialist Labor Arvid Yanovich Pelshe, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee, and USSR Supreme Soviet deputy, died 29 May 1983 in his 85th year after a serious illness.

An eminent figure of the Communist Party and Soviet state, an ardent internationalist, and one of the oldest representatives of the glorious cohort of Leninist Bolsheviks has departed this life.

Arvid Yanovich Pelshe was born 7 February 1899 in Gryunovaldskaya Volost (now Bauskiy Rayon, Latvian SSR) in a peasant family. In 1914 Arvid Yanovich embarked on polytechnical courses in Riga. It was there that he soon established ties with the underground communist organization. In 1915 A.Ya. Pelshe joined the Communist Party. Thenceforth all his activity was inextricably linked with the struggle and historic achievements of the CPSU.

During World War I Arvid Yanovich Pelshe worked at Riga and Vitebsk workshops, as a milling machine operator at the steam engine building plant in Kharkov, as a puncher in Petrograd, and as a truck driver at Arkhangelsk port. Everywhere, on instructions from the party committees, he carried out revolutionary agitation and propaganda. After the February 1917 revolution A.Ya. Pelshe was elected a deputy of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers and Soldiers Deputies. In July-August 1917, as an Arkhangelsk party organization delegate, he took part in the work of the Sixth Communist Party Congress.

Arvid Yanovich Pelshe took an active part in preparing and accomplishing the Great October Socialist Revolution. In 1918 he was a staffer of the All-Russian Extraordinary Commission for Combating Counterrevolution and Sabotage in Moscow. In 1919 he joined the Red Army, in whose ranks he served for 10 years, taking part in fighting on the civil war fronts at Riga and in the Ukraine, and then he worked in army political organs. From 1929 through 1931 A.Ya. Pelshe studied at the Red Professors Institute and at the same time taught at a number of Moscow's higher educational establishments.

From 1933 through 1937 Arvid Yanovich Pelshe was political section chief at the Magadzhanovskiy and Chernoirtyshskiy Sovkhozes, Kazakh SSR, and then he worked at the People's Commissariat of Sovkhozes in Moscow. In 1937 A.Ya. Pelshe was assigned to teaching work and he was awarded the title of lecturer of the Department of Marxism-Leninism.

In early 1941 Arvid Yanovich Pelshe was elected secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee for propaganda and agitation. During the Great Patriotic War, in addition to propaganda work, he engaged in training party and soviet cadres. In November 1959 A.Ya. Pelshe was elected first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee. Under his leadership the party organization achieved great successes in developing the republic's economy and culture. A.Ya. Pelshe was a corresponding member of the Latvian SSR Academy of Sciences from the time of its formation.

Arvid Yanovich Pelshe was a delegate to the 20th and 22d through 26th CPSU Congresses. At the 22d-26th congresses he was elected a member of the CPSU Central Committee. Since 1966 A.Ya. Pelshe had been a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee. He was elected a deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 2d-10th convocations and a deputy of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

In all his posts of party and state activity A.Ya. Pelshe devoted all his efforts and rich experience and knowledge to selfless service of the great ideals of Marxism-Leninism. He contributed to the development of the theory and practice of party building, the organization and implementation of party control, and the consolidation of party and state discipline. A.Ya. Pelshe took a vigorous part in the CPSU's activity in developing ties with the fraternal communist and workers parties.

Arvid Yanovich Pelshe was a man with a big heart and a fine soul. He was distinguished by simplicity and modesty, and an attentive, tactful attitude toward people. He won deep respect in the party and among the people.

Arvid Yanovich Pelshe was awarded two titles of Hero of Socialist Labor, seven Orders of Lenin, one Order of the October Revolution, and many other medals for great service to the motherland.

The bright memory of Arvid Yanovich Pelshe, that loyal son of the Communist Party who devoted his entire life to the great cause of communist building, will remain forever in Soviet people's hearts.

[Signed] Yu.V. Andropov, G.A. Aliyev, M.S. Gorbachev, V.V. Grishin, A.A. Gromyko, D.A. Kunayev, G.V. Romanov, N.A. Tikhonov, D.F. Ustinov, K.U. Chernenko, V.V. Shcherbitskiy, P.N. Demichev, V.I. Doglikh, V.V. Kuznetsov, B.N. Ponomarev, Sh.R. Rashidov, M.S. Solomentsev, E.A. Shevardnadze, I.V. Kapitonov, M.V. Zimyanin, K.V. Rusakov, N.I. Ryzhkov, G.F. Sizov, Ye.K. Ligachev, B.I. Stukalin, K.M. Bogolyubov, I.S. Gustov, G.S. Pavlov, A.E. Voss, A.M. Shkolnikov, A.A. Yepishev, S.A. Shalayev, V.M. Mishin, Yu.Ya. Ruben, P.Ya. Strautmanis, A.K. Malmeyster, V.K. Kruminsh

Funeral Commission Appointed

PM301416 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 31 May 83 p 1

["In the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers" -- SELSKAYA ZHIZN headline]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers have resolved:

1. To form a government commission comprising Comrades V.V. Grishin -- chairman -- M.S. Gorbachev, B.N. Ponomarev, I.V. Kapitonov, A.E. Voss, and I.S. Gustov to organize the funeral of Arvid Yanovich Pelshe, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee.

2. To bury A.Ya. Pelshe at Red Square, by the Kremlin Wall.

Public Viewing Announced

PM301500 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 31 May 83 p 2

[From the Government Commission for Organizing the Funeral of A.Ya. Pelshe, Member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee" -- SELSKAYA ZHIZN headline]

[Text] The Government Commission reports that access to the Hall of Columns in the House of Unions for people to pay their respects to the late A.Ya. Pelshe is open 31 May from 1100 through 1800.

Politburo as Honor Guard

LD310851 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 31 May 83

[Text] Moscow is saying farewell to Arvid Yanovich Pelshe. Profound sorrow has been caused in the hearts of Soviet people by the news of the demise of Arvid Yanovich Pelshe, an eminent figure in the Communist Party and the Soviet state, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee, deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The House of the Unions: On the pediment of the building, framed in mourning, is the portrait of Arvid Yanovich Pelshe.

Today here in the Hall of Columns on a pedestal bedecked in flowers lies a coffin holding the corpse of the deceased. In front of the pedestal on scarlet cushions lie the awards with which were marked the great services of Comrade Pelshe to the homeland. There are two Gold Hammer and Sickle Medals of a Hero of Socialist Labor, there are seven Orders of Lenin, an Order of the October Revolution, many other medals as well as awards from several fraternal socialist states.

Mournful mededies are being played. Near the coffin lies a wreath from the CPSU Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers. Also here is a wreath from the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee. More and more wreaths are being brought into the hall: from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Latvia, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, and the Council of Ministers of the Latvian SSR; from the Central Committees of the Communist Parties, the Presidiums of the Supreme Soviets, and Councils of Ministers of union republics, ministries and departments; the Moscow Gorkom and Gorispolkom; the Moscow Obkom and Oblispolkom; CPSU kraykoms, krayispolkoms, obkoms, and oblispolkoms; public organizations; and from relatives and dear ones of the deceased.

It is 1100. Standing in the guard of honor are Comrades Andropov, Aliyev, Gorbachev, Grishin, Gromyko, Tikhonov, Ustinov, Chernenko, Demichev, Dolgikh, Kuznetsov, Ponomarev, Solomentsev, Zimyanin, Kapitonov, Rusakov, and Ryzhkov.

Then the leaders of the Communist Party and of the Soviet State approach the relatives and dear ones of Pelshe. They express to them their profound condolences.

A watch of mourning is being kept by members of the government commission for organizing the funeral.

There is an endless stream of Muscovites into the Hall of Columns. Workers from plants and factories; staff from the institutions of the capital; workers from the Moscow area; party, soviet, trade union, and Komsomol workers; party veterans; figures from science and culture; representatives of public organizations; troops from the Red Army; and students are taking their leave of Comrade Pelshe.

POLITBURO DISCUSSES FOOD PROGRAM, EDUCATION

LD261753 Moscow TASS in English 1715 GMT 26 May 83

[Text] Moscow May 26 TASS -- The Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee at its regular meeting has discussed the question of implementation of the plans for the delivery of fodder protein and the creation of facilities to produce it in accordance with the Food Programme of the USSR.

A big role of the microbiological industry and of the products turned out by it in the accomplishment of the tasks of creating a firm fodder basis of animal husbandry was emphasized during the discussion of this question. The work of the microbiological industry's main board, which lacks efficiency, purposefulness and exactingness in attaining the state planned targets, in introducing the achievements of science and technology and advanced forms of the organization of labour to production was criticized. There are substantial drawbacks in the work of the ministeries and departments ensuring the construction of the microbiological industry enterprises and the supplying of necessary rawstuffs to them.

The Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee adopted a decision determining measures to improve the work of the microbiological industry and to enhance the responsibility of the leaders of all economic-apparatus sections connected with this branch.

The Central Committees of the Communist Parties of the union republics, territorial and regional party committees were instructed to establish permanent control over the implementation of assignments on development of the microbiological industry, and increase the level of organisational and political work on mobilising labour collectives for overfulfillment of plans of production and deliveries of fodder admixtures for animal husbandry needs.

The Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee also discussed the question of additional measures for improving the study of the Russian language at general education schools and other educational establishments in the union republics. It was noted that as a result of the steady implementation of the Leninist nationalities policy in our country, there take place internationalisation of all sides of social life, mutual enrichment and flourishing of national cultures. The national tongue and literature of all nations and nationalities of the USSR received a great opportunity for all-round and equitable development. All citizens are really ensured the right to get education in the native and other tongues of the Soviet Union's peoples.

At the same time, in the present-day conditions when the country's economy has turned into a united national economic complex, there grows the importance of the Russian language freely adopted by the Soviet people as the means of communication between nationalities. Fluency in the Russian language, along with the vernacular, as correctly pointed out in letters sent by citizens from the provinces, becomes an objective necessity and requirement of each citizen, and helps draw closer all nations and nationalities, strengthen friendship of the USSR's peoples and acquaint them with the spiritual values of domestic and world culture, achievements of scientific and technical progress.

A resolution on this question, adopted by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers in line with the proposals moved from the union and autonomous republics to learn the Russian language, at expanding and improving the training of teachers and raising their skill.

Additional measures were envisaged for publishing textbooks, manuals, and dictionaries, publications on teaching methods and fiction and poetry, for spreading experience of best teachers, party and local government bodies, public organisations in meeting the young people's desire to master the Russian language.

The Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee examined at its meeting some other questions of the country's domestic life, as well as deepening of cooperation between socialist states, consolidation of peace and security between peoples.

NEW FOREIGN ECONOMIC RELATIONS CHIEF APPOINTED

LD272019 Moscow TASS in English 1840 GMT 27 May 83

[Text] Moscow May 27 TASS -- The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has relieved Semen Skachkov of duties of the chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, since he retires on a pension.

For his honest work for the good of the party and the people the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee expressed gratitude to member of the CPSU Central Committee Semen Skachkov.

The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has appointed Yakov Ryabov to the post of chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations.

Yakov Ryabov was born in 1928, Russian, member of the CPSU since 1954. He worked as engineer, head of a design group, chief of a plant's production shop.

He has been engaged in party work since 1958; secretary of the plant's party committee, first secretary of a district party committee, first secretary of the Sverdlovsk City Committee of the CPSU, and since 1971 -- first secretary of the Sverdlovsk City Committee of the CPSU. In 1976-79 he was secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, since February 1979 -- first deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, member of the CPSU Central Committee, deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

COMMUNIST PARTY CADRES PURGED IN MOSCOW REGION

NC281450 Paris AFP in English 1415 GMT 28 May 83

[Text] Moscow, May 28 (AFP) -- A large number of Communist Party cadres and industry chiefs in the Moscow region have been purged in a campaign against violations of party discipline, Moscow Communist Party First Secretary Vasiliy Konotop said in a report quoted today by the local party newspaper LENINSKOYE ZNAMYA.

Observers here said the measures were part of a move launched by Soviet Communist Party chief Yuriy Andropov at the party plenum last November 22 against lack of discipline inside the party, the industry and government.

The work of the party in the Moscow area "did not respond to the guidelines" of the congress, Mr. Konotop said in his report to regional militants.

Referring to letters from workers, Mr. Konotop said inhabitants in several towns had complained about the "bad quality of transport and housing" and of "preferential lists" for the allocation of apartments.

There were numerous cases of "non-respect of the rules of party life," he added, "of a superficial attitude by cadres, and of major violations in municipal management."

The police had also been passive, by concealing offences and delaying investigations, Mr. Konotop added.

WEATHER POSES DIFFICULTIES FOR AGRICULTURE

Flood Damage in Latvia

LD272155 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 May 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] Heavy rains of unprecedented force hit the Jelgava, Dobele and Bauska regions of Latvia last night.

In a few hours, 86 Millimeters of precipitation fell -- nearly one and one-half times the monthly norm. Hundreds of hectares of agricultural sown land and pastures were flooded. The people pitted their endurance and teamwork against the elements. A headquarters for repairing the damage has been set up in the republic. [video of flooded fields and residential areas and of a rescue operation in progress]

Equipment is being sent to the affected areas. The strengthening of hydroelectric installations has begun, and damaged electric power lines are being systematically restored.

Cyclone, Snow in Kazakhstan

LD272005 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1300 GMT 27 May 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Excerpts] North Kazakhstan and Kustanay Oblasts of Kazakhstan have finished sowing wheat. [Begin V. Glukhovtsev -- identified by caption -- video recording] The first to finish sowing wheat in Turgay Oblast were the farmers of the Arkalyk experimental center. It was not an easy task during the sowing season, both here at the testing station, where over 30,000 hectares are allocated to spring crops, and indeed throughout the Virgin Lands of Kazakhstan; during the height of the sowing season a mighty cyclone was unleashed on the northern oblasts, with downpours, snow and squalls. For several days the bad weather prevented people from sowing grain and the lost time had to be made up.

The sowing was completed in the optimum time.

PROGRESS IN FEED PREPARATION REPORTED

LD262256 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 26 May 83

[Text] By 23 May 2.5 million hectares of sown and meadow grasses had been gathered throughout the country. This is reported by the Central Statistical Administration. Most of this is located at farms in the Ukraine, Eduard Viktorovich Bessarabov, deputy chief of the Main Administration for Fodders, Meadows and Pastures of the USSR Ministry of Agriculture, noted. The preparation of feed is progressing in 14 union republics. Throughout the country, favorable conditions are being created for the first cutting of grasses. They are ripening early and in a few days time haymaking will commence in Russia's Nonchernozem Zone. Altogether about 1 million tons of hay and almost 2.5 million tons of haylage have been prepared throughout the country.